THE

CYCLOPÆDIA

OF

Temperance and Prohibition.

A Reference Book of Facts, Statistics, and General Information
on All Phases of the Drink Question, the Temperance
Movement and the Prohibition Agitation.

FUNK & WAGNALLS.
NEW YORK.
LONDON. TORONTO.
1891.

Printed in the United States. All rights reserved.

HV
5017
.C93

~~178.03
F96~~

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1891, by
FUNK & WAGNALLS,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington, D. C.

[Registered at Stationer's Hall, London, Eng.]

PREFACE.

The growing prominence of the drink question is one of the undoubted, indeed, one of the most conspicuous, facts of our time. Both the observer of affairs and the student of tendencies must testify to this; and the understanding of it is strengthened by comprehensiveness and dispassionateness of view. Throughout Continental Europe the ablest writers are discussing the evils of alcoholism and devising remedies. Organized effort is being developed, even in these most conservative nations. The International Conferences "against the abuse of alcoholic liquors" attract many of the leaders of thought and reform. The Brussels Anti-Slavery Conference, representing countries in which the liquor traffic is practically unrestricted, has taken American legislation as a pattern and incorporated in its general act for Africa a chapter prohibiting the furnishing of spirits to native races. And this action is not without Continental precedents: for five years the fishermen of the North Sea have been forbidden to purchase or carry distilled drink, and for a longer time Prohibition of the entire liquor business has been the normal policy of the Swedish and Norwegian rural communities. In England and all English-speaking countries total abstinence is no longer a "fad" but a mark of discretion and intelligence; the Prohibitory doctrine is no longer a preposterous creed but an economic programme that begins to fairly divide public sentiment, parties, Legislatures and constituencies. Organizations having annual incomes of tens of thousands of pounds are urging advanced measures in the United Kingdom. The people of Scotland, voting by the plebiscite system, have declared by overwhelming majorities in favor of clothing the citizens with power to outlaw public houses at the ballot-box. Twice the yeomanry of Great Britain, with signal earnestness and enthusiasm, have rejected the proposition to bestow compensation for cancelled licenses, giving the weight of popular indorsement to the decree of the highest Courts of England, that there exists no such thing as a "vested right" in the liquor trade—a significant repetition of those solemn words of our own Supreme Court:

R5003

"There is no inherent right in a citizen to sell intoxicating liquors by retail; it is not a privilege of a citizen of the State or a citizen of the United States." In the land of its birth the temperance movement, despite temporary checks, advances surely. There is no State of the Union where liquor-selling is not a most detestable vocation and rumseller a most opprobrious name. Total abstinence for the individual is splendidly vindicated by its results everywhere; great railroad and other corporations require it in their employes; insurance companies discriminate in favor of the teetotaler and rank the liquor-maker and vendor with the uncleanest of men; the Labor leaders take public pledges of abstinence, denounce alcohol in unmeasured language and cordially advocate Prohibitory Amendments; the churches are all but unanimous in recommending total abstinence; the Government itself bears witness to the needlessness and hurtfulness of intoxicants by prohibiting the sale of spirits and wines in the canteens and by the post-traders of the American army, by excluding the whole traffic from public buildings and grounds and by forbidding, under severe penalties, all sales to Indians. The policy of Prohibition by the State rests on broad and firm foundations; the evidence of its beneficial results cannot be controverted, and no attempt is made to gainsay it by fair means; while the absolute and uniform failure of the compromise system of High License attests the fatuity of the hope that some solution may be commanded by regulation.

Tirelessness of argument is the quality of the propagandist; and the temperance reformers, as industrious writers, yield to none. An ample literature has been created for the illustration and promotion of their cause. The works of Richardson, Lees, Kerr, Eddy, Pitman, Dawson Burns, Farrar, Oswald, Gustafson, Wheeler and various others, are examples of information, authority and capacity which compare favorably with the products of other reform movements. It is characteristic of the really important and candid books on this question that, with the rarest exceptions, they either advocate radical opinions or point to them. This cannot be attributed to a lack of resourcefulness in the opposition, which has talented defenders and sympathizers. The facts do not warrant weighty defense of dram-drinking or the dram commerce: this truth comes as forcibly to the cautious investigator as it does to the citizen at his fireside. So it happens that the counteractive works are of little significance. Exception must be made, however, for some of the writings of conservative men, who, while not justifying but indeed abhorring drunkenness and the common saloon, are unable to agree to certain advanced propositions and attack them with courage and ability. But even the volumes of this class, or the ones answering to the test conditions that we have indicated, importance and candor, are surprisingly few.

In the preparation of the succeeding pages the fruits of the excellent work done by others have been of great and constant service. This Cyclopædia cannot take the place of any of the standard temperance publications; and if it spreads the appreension of their value by the frequency of quotations and references, no small part of its purpose will have been performed. To all the writers mentioned above, and to many more, the editor is under profound obligations. The "Temperance History" of Dr. Dawson Burns has supplied much of the historical information. Dr. Richard Eddy's two admirable volumes, "Alcohol in History" and "Alcohol in Society," indispensable to everyone who seeks the best results of literary labor in the discussion of this subject, have been equally useful. And the "Temperance Cyclopædia" of the Rev. William Reid (composed exclusively of extracts and citations) must not be forgotten in alluding to the chief sources of help.

The central aim has been, while particularizing with as great exhaustiveness as possible within the limits fixed by the publishers, to subordinate minutæ to outlines. The aggregate number of articles may seem comparatively small, and each reflecting reader will probably be able to make up a list of appropriate topics not formally treated under separate titles. But it is hoped that the care which has been expended on the leading articles, and the effort which has been made to embrace in these articles the legitimate accessory subjects, will be satisfactory recompense. And though numerous branches are thus considered incidentally, the reader will be able to locate them by due use of the Index. In such a work, indeed, where so many details are presented accessorily, the Index is a most important feature.

Naturally, the practical aspects of the anti-liquor agitation are made most conspicuous—the aspects that are of greatest interest to the public and that excite warmest controversy. The results of the three leading systems of liquor legislation—State Prohibition, Local Option and High License—have not until very recently been subjected to fair and comprehensive analysis. The relative qualities of these results must determine the future of the Prohibition struggle, and the editor has undertaken to show the main truths in a thorough and an orderly manner. To the chief Prohibition journal, the *Voice*, credit is due for most of the facts.

It was at first intended to include biographical sketches of eminent living representatives of the temperance cause, and a great deal of material was gathered with this purpose in view. But the difficulty of discriminating with strictness and at the same time with delicacy and justice—a difficulty which is highly perplexing to all compilers of cyclopædias,—was so serious that the solution seemed to be in the abandonment of this part of the enterprise. The only exceptions are in the cases of the Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates of the Prohibitionists. Several prominent men—notably Rev. George B. Cheever, D. D., author of "Deacon Giles's Distillery," and Judge Robert C. Pitman, author of "Alcohol and the State,"—have died while the book has been in press. This explains the omission of their biographies.

The cordial thanks of the editor are due to the writers of contributed articles and to the many who have co-operated by providing valuable information. Partial acknowledgment for services is made in the text and the footnotes. It is fitting, however, to mention more conspicuously a few to whose kindness the editor is especially indebted. These are: Hon. James Black, Mrs. Caroline B. Buell, Mr. John N. Stearns, Rev. D. C. Babcock, Rev. John A. Brooks, D.D., Hon. John P. St. John, Axel Gustafson, Mrs. Mary Clement Leavitt, Miss Frances E. Willard, Rev. D. W. C. Huntington, D.D., William Hargreaves, M.D., Mrs. Mary A. Livermore, Hon. Benson J. Lossing, Rev. Albert G. Lawson, D.D., Mrs. Mary T. Lathrap, Rev. A. B. Leonard, D.D., Joseph Malins (England), Hon. John O'Donnell, T. C. Richmond, Rev. John Russell, Rev. W. W. Satterlee, Frank J. Sibley, A. A. Stevens, Hon. Gideon T. Stewart, Rev. Green Clay Smith, John Lloyd Thomas, Prof. Edwin V. Wright, Rev. Henry Ward, D.D., Mrs. Charlotte F. Woodbury and Miss Mary Allen West. Among the others who have rendered appreciated assistance (not acknowledged in the body of the book) are Ryland T. Brown (Indianapolis), L. J. Beauchamp, Rollo Kirk Bryan, Miss Mary A. Baker (Chicago), Prof. A. C. Bacone (Indian Territory), O. R. L. Crozier (Ann Arbor), J. W. Chickering (Washington, D. C.), Mrs. W. F. Crafts, Miss Julia Coleman, Albert Dodge, Rev. H. A. Delano, Mrs. Emma P. Ewing (Kansas City), Rev. J. B. English (New York), Mrs. Nettie B. Fernald (Plainfield, N. J.), H. B. Gibbud (Syracuse, N. Y.), C. A. Hammond (Syracuse, N. Y.), Mrs. Mary H. Hunt, Mrs. F. McC. Harris (Brooklyn), Mrs. S. M. I. Henry (Evanston, Ill.), Rev. J. B. Helwig, D.D. (Springfield, O.), H. W. Hardy (Lincoln, Neb.), R. E. Hudson (Alliance, O.), M. L. Holbrook, M.D. (Jersey City), Rev. John Hall, D.D., Rev. Henry B. Hudson (Brooklyn), George La Monte (Bound Brook, N. J.), Rev. S. A. Morse (Rochester, N. Y.), Hon. Henry B. Metcalf, Miss Esther Pugh, Frederic A. Pike (St. Paul), Gen. W. F. Singleton, Charles A. Sherlin, G. B. Thompson (West Pittston, Pa.), Thomas R. Thompson (New Haven), Rev. C. S. Woodruff (Montclair, N. J.) and Prof. W. C. Wilkinson.

CYCLOPÆDIA OF TEMPERANCE AND PROHIBITION.

Absinthe.—See SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS.

Adulteration.—The art of adulteration is practiced by no other class of manufacturers and tradesmen so extensively and unscrupulously as by those engaged in the liquor traffic. This peculiar traffic, branded by public opinion as disreputable and demoralizing, offers few inducements to conscientious and honorable men. Those disposed to produce and sell genuine liquors encounter many temptations and serious discouragements. The taste of the great mass of drinkers does not and cannot discriminate between the genuine and the spurious. The conscienceless manufacturers and sellers engaged in the business, with a full understanding of its odious nature, are ready to adopt any means that will promote their sole object—to amass riches swiftly; and the honest maker or vendor is likely to find no buyers in a market where practically every other person in the trade is enabled and disposed by sharp tricks to undersell him. Equally unencouraging are the conditions encountered by those who wish to cater in good faith to more exacting appetites: the resources of the liquor-adulterating art provide means for imitating the costliest brands. "There is in the city," wrote Addison in the *Tattler*, "a certain fraternity of chemical operators, who work underground in holes, caverns, and dark retirements, to conceal their mysteries from the eye and observation of mankind. These subterranean philosophers are daily employed in the transmutation of liquors, and by the power of magical drugs and incantations raising under the streets of London the choicest products of the hills and valleys of France."[1] And in our own day, so eminent an authority as Dr. Henry Letheby, Ph.D., formerly Medical Officer of Health to the City of London, says: "A great part of the wine of France and Germany has ceased to be the juice of the grape at all. In point of fact, the processes of blending, softening, fortifying, sweetening, etc., etc., are carried on to such an extent that it is hardly possible to obtain a sample of genuine wine, even at first hand."[2]

ADULTERATION OF WINES.

Whenever a liquor trafficker becomes converted to temperance principles, he makes haste to expose the terrible adulterations by which well-nigh all the drink offered for consumption is falsified. Major C. B. Cotten, formerly a wholesale liquor-dealer of New York, in contributions to the *Voice* in 1885, gave elaborate information upon this subject, based, he said, upon "twenty-five years of my own personal experience as a manufacturer of these compounds."

> "The imitation and adulteration of foreign wines in this country (he wrote) has become a business of large proportions. From 1,250,000 to 1,500,000 gallons of pure spirits is used in the city of New York and in the Eastern cities annually, in addition to large quantities of native and Rhine wine and Jersey cider, in the manufacture of fictitious wines of all kinds; and I think I may safely estimate the value of these fraudulent wines at seven to nine millions of dollars annually. In the manufacture of these wines, six distinct principles must be rigidly adhered to: *the bouquet*, in perfect imitation of the genuine; *the alcohol*. thoroughly deodorized and of standard strength; *water*, *sugar*, *astringent*

---

[1] The *Tattler*, No. 131.

[2] Encyclopædia Brittanica, article on "Adulteration."

and *acid matters*, and *coloring*. On the proper adjustment and assimilation of these different ingredients success depends. Perhaps there is no business requiring more close and unerring judgment and so perfect a knowledge of chemical combinations as the art—for it is really an art—of making perfect fictitious wines. As a basis for these wines we use—as I have already said—pure spirits perfectly deodorized, in connection, sometimes, with cheap native wines or white Rhine wines, but generally with Jersey cider, the juice of the crab-apple being preferred. The process is very similar to making wine from the grape, and its perfection depends upon nearly the same principles. The cider is taken directly from the press to a properly arranged and tempered cellar, and carefully carried through the first or saccharine fermentation at a temperature of 60° F. It is then fined and drawn off into large tanks, and when still, spirits, crude tartar and other ingredients are added to stop the fermentation This forms the basis for nearly all kinds of imitation wines. The basis being prepared, we then proceed at our leisure to make up our stock. We want some particular brand of champagne, for instance, Piper Heidsieck. We draw from one of the large tanks into a smaller one, called a mixer, the necessary amount of cider for, say, 100 baskets. The liquid is brought up to the standard alcoholic proof with pure spirits, then we add the flavorings and coloring, after which the temperature is raised to 70° or 72° F., to induce the second or vinous fermentation. After this is effected, we put it through a course of fining, when it becomes a bright, rich, sparkling, vinous liquid, and is ready for bottling. It is then drawn off into imported champagne bottles, and fully charged with carbonic acid gas. Imported velvet corks—each cork branded on the inner end with the name of the supposed foreign wine maker—are driven in by machinery. After the bottles have been duly sealed, wired, capped and stamped, labels in exact imitation of the genuine are placed upon them, and the bottles in turn are packed in imported baskets or in cases with imported straw. Imitations of the genuine marks and numbers are then placed upon the package, and the deception is complete. By this process any brand of imported wine is successfully imitated. Suppose we want fifty barrels of sherry. We draw from the same tank into the mixer the requisite quantity of cider, which is brought up to about 22° to 24° alcoholic proof with pure spirits. Then for every barrel we add 3 lbs. mashed Malaga raisins, ¼ oz. oil of bitter almonds, and six gallons pure sherry wine. After this mixture has stood two or three days, it is drawn off through a strainer into another tub, when it is fined and made ready to put into the barrels. We then send an imported cask to our cooper, and he makes us fifty casks exactly like the sample. The new and bright barrels are then put into a coloring tub and come out dirty, stained, old-looking barrels. They are then properly branded, and bogus Custom House marks are placed upon them, and again art has triumphed over nature. And so we go through the whole catalogue of wines. In coloring wines, either fictitious or foreign, when deficient in color, we use for a fawn yellow or sherry color, tincture of saffron, tumeric, or safflower; for amber or deep brown, burned sugar coloring. Cochineal, with a little alum, gives a pink color; beet root and red saunders, a red color; the extract of rhatany and logwood, and the juices of elder-berries and bilberries a port wine color. Sometimes our wines become muddy—or in our parlance, 'sick'—and we have to fine or 'recover' them. For this purpose we use the white of an egg, isinglass, hartshorn shavings, or pale sweet glue; for heavy wines, sheep's or bullock's blood. Gypsum is used to fine muddy white wines, also sugar of lead and bisulphate of potassium. When we find a lack of flavor, we use, according to circumstances, burned almonds or the essential oil, to give a nutty flavor, and rhatany, kino, oak sawdust or bark, with alum, to give astringency. To impart the fine flavors, we use orris root, orange blossoms, neroli, violet petals, vanilla, cedrat, sweetbrier, cardamon seeds, quinces, elder-berries or cherry laurel. When our wines need *improving*, we use, in sherry, Madeira and port, almond flavorings, rhatany or catechu, with honey or glycerine. For *mustiness*, we use sweet oil or almond oil, fresh burned charcoal, bread toasted black or bruised mustard seed. For *ropiness*, the bruised berries of the mountain-ash, catechu, chalk, milk of lime, and calcined oyster-shells are used, and, if very bad, we use litharge. . . . New frauds are being constantly developed in the manufacture of fictitious wines, and the business of preparing these poisonous flavorings has attained the dimensions of an important branch of trade. This new industry is becoming more and more important. These flavorings of a complex nature are used for the purpose of giving wines particular bouquets. By adding a small quantity of these compounds, new and fresh wine may be converted into the semblance of old wine in a very few minutes, or certain poor wines may be made to resemble those of famous vintages. These ethers, designed for giving the bouquet, are numbered among the six great classes of materials serving for the adulteration or fabrication of wines. Establishments for the manufacture of these flavorings are located in London, Paris, New York and other large cities, and the business is large and profitable." [1]

Among the substances used in adulterating wines are: Aloes, alum, ambergris, acetic acid, acetic ether, benzine, brimstone, bitter almonds, bicarbonate of potassium, bisulphate of potassium, Brazil wood, creosote, charcoal, chalk, copperas, catechu, cudbear, cochineal, caustic potash, cognac oil, cocculus indicus, elderberry, essence of absinthe, foxglove, fusel oil, glue, glycerine, gypsum, henbane, hartshorn shavings, indigo, juniper berries, lime, logwood, litharge, marble dust, muriatic acid, mountain ash berries, nutgalls, opium, oak bark, plaster of Paris, prussic acid, quassia, red saunders-wood, red beet-root, strychnine, sloe leaves, spermaceti, star anise, sulphuric acid, sugar of lead, tansy, tumeric, tannic acid and wormwood.

---

[1] The *Voice*, Jan. 22, 1885.

The vineyards of the great wine-producing countries have been devastated for the last twenty years by the phylloxera, and it is a matter of record that the quantities of wine actually produced in certain famous districts have been vastly decreased by this insect's ravages; yet wines of every kind and name have become more plentiful than before. (See PHYLLOXERA.) It has long been notorious that particular countries, like England and the United States, consume more pretended champagne, port, sherry, Madeira, etc., than the districts where these special kinds of wine are made yield.[1]

A form of adulteration very generally in use among the makers of spurious wines is called "fortification." To a quantity of wine raw alcohol is added, and the strength of the resulting compound is reduced and its bulk very much increased by liberally diluting it with water. Thus by a very simple process the dishonest dealer swells his stock and enhances its marketable value. No secret is made of the "fortifying" method. The California wine-makers, while advertising their brands as "pure" and "straight," have been so bold in demanding cheap alcohol for "fortification" purposes that they have made a political issue of the matter; and during the Congressional session of 1890 a measure was enacted providing that spirits required by wine manufacturers in their business should not be subject to the Internal Revenue tax. Spain formerly imported from England about 1,600,000 gallons of spirits annually, by far the largest part of which was used to "fortify" the celebrated Spanish wines; but Germany offered a cheaper article, manufactured from beets and potatoes, and the adept Spanish vintners then preferred the German alcohol to the British.[2]

The presence of the most deleterious substances in well-nigh all the wine offered for sale has been repeatedly shown by careful investigation. A striking instance is reported by George Walker, formerly United States Consul-General at Paris. The Municipal Laboratory of that city, during the ten months ending December, 1881, tested 3,001 samples of wines, and found 1,731 to be "bad," 991 "passable," and only 279 "good." (U. S. Consular reports, vol. 6, p. 559.)

ADULTERATIONS OF MALT LIQUORS.

The adulterations of malt liquors, though perhaps not executed with so much nicety as is needed in falsifying wines, are perpetrated on an equally extensive scale. In England the rascally practices of the brewers have at various times in the last 200 years occasioned the passage of special legislation against beer adulteration. In the reign of Queen Anne Parliament passed an act forbidding brewers, under severe penalties, to employ cocculus indicus or any other deleterious ingredients. In 1817 the Government found it necessary to establish more rigid provisions, and prohibited the use of "molasses, honey, licorice, vitriol, quassia, cocculus indicus, grains of paradise, Guinia pepper, or opium, or any extract or preparation of the same, or any substitute for malt or hops, under a penalty of £200; and no chemist or vendor of drugs was permitted to sell, send or deliver any such things to a brewer or retailer of beer under a penalty of £500."[3]

The cocculus indicus berry, stronger than alcohol in its poisonous action, is the favorite adulterant used by brewers to give fictitious strength to their product. The growing increase in the importation of cocculus indicus into England prompted the London *Lancet* to say, March 2, 1867:

> "If it be true that we English consume about 900 000,000 gallons of beer every year—an increase of about 40 per cent. in ten years—ample opportunity must exist for adulteration in this particular article of general and everyday consumption. It has been asserted over and over again that one of the ingredients is cocculus indicus. Though we are not aware of any actual proof of its use, there is the most conclusive evidence that it is largely sent into this country, and that it is not used for medicinal purposes. What becomes of it? In 1865, 9,400 lbs. were imported, enough to adulterate 120,000 bbls. of beer; and in an old treatise we find full directions given for its employment in

---

[1] Before the Select Committee on Wines (House of Commons, 1352). Cyrus Redding stated that though the annual export of port wine amounted to only 20,000 pipes no less than 60,000 were consumed, a goodly amount being concocted out of Cape wines, cider and brandies, etc., most of the spurious being concocted in the London docks, presumably for exportation.—*Foundation of Death* (New York, 1887), p. 48.

[2] On the authority of Mr. Vizitelly, British Wine Commissioner to the Vienna Exposition.

[3] *Encyclopædia Brittanica*, article on "Adulteration."

the manufacture of porter. The only inference that we can possibly draw is, that it is used by the brewers surreptitiously. Unfortunately there is no duty imposed upon the drug, which is very much to be regretted. As it is not employed as a medicine, and is known to possess most deleterious qualities, and suspected to be used for the doctoring of beer, it seems to us most advisable to call attention to the above facts and to ask that some steps may be taken to prevent the possibility of its being used at all in England."

Again (Feb. 21, 1874), the *Lancet*, commenting on a statement in the *Pharmaceutical Journal* that 1,066 bags of cocculus indicus had been imported in a recent month, said that there need be "no hesitation in affirming that a very large portion of it is put into malt liquor to give it strength and headiness," and that "a viler agent could not well be introduced into beer than the berry, the stupefying effects of which are so well known that it is frequently used to kill fish and birds." The object of using the cocculus indicus and other injurious substances, like picric acid, aloes, quassia, buckbean, gentian, phosphoric acid, alum, copperas, glycerine, oil of vitriol, sulphate of iron, etc., is, of course, to give the maximum strength and flavor to the beer at the minimum cost.

The brewers stoutly resist every attempt to legislate against adulteration. In 1890 the United States House of Representatives had under consideration the Turner bill, prohibiting the use by brewers of any ingredients other than malt, hops and yeast. The Committee on Ways and Means granted a hearing (June 12) to persons interested in the measure, and Col. H. H. Finley, arguing in favor of its passage, cited advertisements of various adulterants that had appeared in the *Brewers' Journal* (chief organ of the brewing interests of America). At this hearing the United States Brewers' Association was represented by Dr. Francis Wyatt, a chemist, and by William A. Miles, Chairman of its Executive Committee, and both gentlemen earnestly opposed the bill and declared that the brewers wished to avail themselves of the resources of science without hindrance.

ADULTERATION OF SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS.

Spirituous liquors are adulterated by using inferior alcohol and terrible acids, especially tannic, acetic, pyroligneous and pyroxylic acids, and the oil of creosote, together with glucose, essence of angelica, oil of vitriol, etc. In the natural process of distillation a comparatively long period is required for ageing the liquor, but by unscrupulous means the distillers are able to artificially ripen their spirits and thus avoid the necessity of keeping them for several years. The whiskey manufacturers are constantly striving to produce the maximum quantity of whiskey per bushel of grain. Formerly a gallon and a half per bushel was the average amount obtained, but now three, four and five gallons are extracted from a bushel. This increase is obtained partly by applying a higher heat in distilling the grain, and that necessarily implies a much greater percentage of impurities in the resulting liquor, and especially a larger quantity of fusel oil. Liquors sold as brandy, gin and Jamacia rum are almost invariably fraudulent articles, vilely compounded. "The greater portion of the brandy of the United States," says Dr. William A. Hammond, "is made here from whiskey, and nine-tenths of the rest is manufactured in France and England in the same way. Liquors called brandies are thus made which are not worth a ninth part as much as brandy."[1]

The United States Consul at Bordeaux, in 1882, George Gifford, made a detailed investigation concerning French brandies, and wrote, in an official report: "All French brandy might and perhaps ought to be excluded from the United States on sanitary grounds. A general measure excluding the article would seem, therefore, to be the only effective defense against the admission of a poison for which our people pay one or two million dollars a year, besides the import duty, which in the case of an impure article is over 100 per cent. of its invoice value."

Some writers and speakers, in discussing the drink question, maintain that the enactment and rigid enforcement of laws for suppressing adulterations would go far towards correcting the worst evils of the liquor traffic. Accordingly "Pure Wine" laws have been passed in New York and California, and various provisions against adulterations are contained in the statutes of other States. These measures are of no practical value: no prosecutions are conducted under them, and they are helpful rather than harmful to the "trade," because in the absence of arrests and convictions the drink-dealers are able to plausibly claim that no adulterations are practiced. The political power of the liquor men is sufficient to prevent any honest crusade by the authorities against adulteration.

---

[1] Treatise on Hygiene (New York, 1863), pp. 553-4.

On the other hand, the organized temperance people, recognizing that the active principle of evil in all intoxicating drinks is alcohol more than any other drug or poison, or all others combined, and that an extension of the alcoholic habit would undoubtedly result if the public could feel assured of the purity of the liquors on the market, have generally manifested indifference to the demand for anti-adulteration laws.

Advent Christian Church. — No action on the Prohibition question has been taken by the National Association of this church at any annual meeting for several years. This statement is made on the authority of the editor of the *World's Crisis*, the leading denominational organ.

Africa. — The home of aboriginal tribes, the greater part of Africa has been comparatively free from the liquor curse until recent years. It is true native intoxicants have been and are prepared from the sap of the palm and other substances, and African travelers have described the gross debauchery witnessed at times; but there is every reason to believe that the African native did not acquire an adequate realization of the corrupting power of alcoholic stimulants until brought into contact with the traders of Christian nations. In the portions of the continent conquered by the Mohammedans, and ruled by them for centuries, the advent of new institutions was not attended by a systematic introduction of the drink habit, although the Moslem peoples of Africa gradually yielded to the alcohol vice and (especially in Tunis, Tripoli and other parts of the Mediterranean coast) became free drinkers. During the pre-Mohammedan era of civilization in Africa, however, intemperance was prevalent from the remotest ages.

MEDITERRANEAN COAST COUNTRIES.

Egypt.—It is believed that the ancient Egyptians were the earliest brewers, and it is known that they had establishments for the manufacture of intoxicating beverages several centuries before Christ. The Egyptian monuments picture the wine-press and vineyard, and the various aspects of intoxication. Mohammedan dominion in Egypt began in the year 640 A. D., and continued without serious interruption until Bonaparte's invasion in 1798. The country then began to lose its purely oriental character, and none of the Western innovations were regarded with greater solicitude by the inhabitants than the wine and spirit shops established by the French. Since then, enterprising tradesmen from all European nations have overrun Egypt; and in every city, most of the large towns and many of the smallest villages, there are places devoted to the sale of liquors, in connection with other merchandise. Probably a majority of the liquor traders in Egypt at present are Greeks. In Cairo, at the beginning of 1890, there were 1,320 cafes, of which 180 were kept by Europeans, and in every one of these European shops liquors were for sale; while of the 1,140 cafes kept by natives, only 287 had liquors in stock. The values of wines, spirits and beer imported into the country for ten years are given as follows: 1877, $700,570; 1878, $821,565; 1879, $861,125; 1880, $921,720; 1881, $1,163,830; 1882, $1,299,095; 1883, $1,721,615; 1884, $1,733,605; 1885, $1,951,405; 1886, $1,815,605. These figures are only approximate, the exact quantities imported not being known to the Custom House officials. In 1884, 787 cases and 8,223 barrels of beer, valued at £20,215, were sent by the British Government for the use of the Army of Occupation, and in addition to these quantities, a great deal of liquor was furnished to the army by contractors and others. Of the drinks of native manufacture, *araka* is the chief, taking its name from a word that means "to sweat." It is distilled from grapes or dates, and the proportion of alcohol contained in it varies from 10 to 30 per cent. Another common drink, used by the lower classes and Nile boatmen, is *booza*, a sort of beer brewed from wheat, barley or bread. The worst intoxicant in Egypt is hasheesh, obtained from the leaves and capsules of hemp, and consumed by smoking. It is estimated that about two-thirds of the insanity of the country is due to hasheesh. The importation of the drug is prohibited, but it is smuggled through the Custom House and introduced in ingenious ways. There is as yet no Government complicity with the liquor traffic in Egypt, and no organized "liquor power," the sale being practically free. But with the increase of the foreign-born population, and the growing acceptance of Western ideas and customs by the Copts and Mohammedans, the liquor drinking habit is spreading. Several temperance societies have been established in connection with the work of the American missionaries, but aside from them there are no organized agencies for counteracting the evil.[1]

Algeria, etc.—In the other countries of Northern Africa bordering on the Mediterranean, the injunctions of the Koran against the use of intoxicants are treated with small respect by the Mohammedans, and the constantly growing influence of the French and other Europeans is uniformly exercised for extending the liquor trade in all its branches. The common beverage is the palm wine, obtained from the date palm by means of incisions made at the base of the trunk. This drink is intoxicating, and being so easily procured is used by well-nigh everybody and works sad havoc among the people. The Jews in Algeria, Tunis, Tripoli and Morocco are extensively engaged in the drink traffic and in wine production. Formerly the Algerian farmers were content to use their lands for cultivating food staples, but discovering from the experience of the planters of Tunis that viniculture was much more profitable, they have devoted themselves to it in recent years, so that large vineyards have been laid out in both countries, and the growing of grapes for wine is rapidly becoming the chief occupation of the peasantry. The Mohammedans do not scruple to participate in this industry. The vineyards of the Jews of Jerba Island, Tunis, produce wines which connoisseurs are said to compare with "those of Samos and Santorin," while the wine manufactured in Algeria has been for years more or less famous. Large companies have been formed in Algeria to clear land and plant vineyards thousands of acres in area. The estimates of the wine-yield of Algeria are conflicting. M. Tisserand, in 1885, in the *Journal of the Statistical Society* (London), placed it at 22,000,000 imperial gallons for the year 1884. In the latest edition of Mulhall (1886) it is stated that the Algerian vintage at the time of that publication was only 9,000,000 gallons. The United States Consul at Marseilles (France), in a report dated Feb. 27, 1889, placed the vintage of 1888 in Algeria at 72,072,788 gallons, ranking that country after Italy, France, Spain, Hungary, Portugal, Austria and Russia among the wine-producing nations of the globe. It is probable that the larger estimates are nearer the truth—at least that they represent more reliably than the smaller figures the quantities of stuff produced and sold as wine in Algeria. That country is now fully controlled by the French, whose ingenuity is increasingly taxed to supply the world's demand for French wines, and who are taking advantage to the utmost of the capabilities of their African provinces.

MADEIRA, THE CANARIES AND AZORES.

Madeira, the Canaries and the Azores, the important islands off the west coast of Africa, are celebrated for their wines. In the 16th century the principal industry of the Madeira Islands was sugar-cane cultivation, but this gradually gave way to viniculture, the grape-vine having been introduced from Candia in the 15th century. The finer grades of wines produced, known as dry Madeira and malvoisie, soon acquired a reputation, and in 1820, when the prosperity of the Madeira wine-makers was at its height, the total yield was 2,650,000 gallons, valued at about $2,500,000. In 1852 the oïdium attacked the vineyards and did great injury, and ten or twelve years later the phylloxera made its appearance, and again the vines were wasted. But Madeira continues to export wine, or wine blended with the ordinary white wine of Portugal, or with cider or alcohol, or even the juice of the sugar-cane. The quantity exported in 1884[2] was 353,000 gallons, valued at about $640,000. The islanders of the Canaries formerly made large shipments of excellent sugar to Europe, but like their Madeira neighbors they turned their attention to wines. Their vineyards have been ravaged by insects within the last thirty years. There have been similar vicissitudes in the Azores, where, up to the middle of the present century, a white wine of indifferent quality was abundant. In the Azores orange groves have replaced the ruined vineyards, but the distilling business is attaining importance, sweet potatoes and yams being used.

---

[1] For the particulars about Egypt the editor is indebted to Rev. J. O. Ashenhurst, an American missionary at Cairo.

[2] The Earth and Its Inhabitants, vol. 3, p. 508.

EAST AFRICAN COUNTRIES.

Abyssinia, etc.—Along the Upper Nile and in the lake regions the natives have had but little intercourse with the commercial representatives of Christian civilization, and have not yet experienced the horrors of the "white man's drink." Nearly every tribe brews a rude beer, or prepares a beverage of some sort, but these inland people have lacked opportunities for reducing themselves to the depths of degradation by means of the most potent stimulants. In Kaffaland the common cereals, wheat, barley and haricots, are not in general use as aliments for man, but are fed to cattle and converted into beer. In Abyssinia beer is brewed from *dakussa*, the most widely distributed grain, although in some parts of this country (especially among the Harrari) an intoxicant is prepared from a mixture of bark and dried leaves. In former years the vine (probably transplanted from Europe) was extensively cultivated in Middle Abyssinia. Some of the wines obtained (notably those of Ifag and Koarata) were from plants brought in by the Portuguese, and were highly esteemed. But these vines were nearly all destroyed by the oïdium. It is said by some travelers that King Theodore co-operated with this insect in its work, uprooting the vineyards on the ground that wine ought to be reserved for beings superior to mortals.

In the countries of the east coast the practices of the people in reference to intoxicants differ widely. Throughout the Somali territory (excepting in the Ogaden country, in Central Somali, where a fermented drink is prepared from camel's milk) the use of alcoholic drinks is prohibited. In the country of the Masai, south-west of Somali and west of Zanzibar, where "the physical type is one of the finest and noblest in the whole of Africa,"[1] the natives have learned by experience that intoxicating liquors and tobacco tend to debase man physically and morally; and there is a rigid prohibition against them. The African Lake Society, founded in 1878 and trading in the region of Lake Nyassa, is forbidden by the terms of its charter to furnish any intoxicants to the natives.

Madagascar. — By royal decree and recent enactments, prohibition of the trade in spirits is also the law in the province of Imerina in the island of Madagascar, this province being inhabited by the Hovas, the most powerful of the Madagascar natives. Before the introduction of Christianity into Madagascar by the London Missionary Society, there was much intoxication among the people, who consumed a fermented drink made from the sweet sap of trees. The first sovereign who became a Christian ordered that all the trees yielding this sap should be cut down, and this radical action put an end to drunkenness until the Governments of Great Britian and France, at the demand of a few sugar-planters in Mauritius, who distilled rum from the refuse of their mills and sought a convenient market for the stuff, compelled Madagascar to consent to the importation of liquors. Ten per cent. of the liquors imported from abroad belongs to the reigning sovereign of the Hovas, but Queen Ranavalona II. steadfastly refused to derive a revenue from the demoralization of her people, and always had her share poured out upon the ground at the landing-place at Tamatave. The present queen, Ranavalona III., also objects to the liquor traffic within her dominions, and is solicitous for a modification of the treaty stipulations; but both France and Great Britain have so far refused to grant relief, and upon these nations rests the responsibility for the resulting degradation.[2]

---

[1] The Earth and Its Inhabitants, vol. 4, p. 364.

[2] The editor is indebted to Mrs. Mary Clement Leavitt for the facts about Madagascar.

We quote the following from Archdeacon Farrar, based, in part, upon information given in the report of a recent British and Colonial Temperance Congress:

"In 1800 the Malagasy were a nation of idolaters; now, thanks in great measure to the London Missionary Society, they are a nation of Christians. They loved, they almost adored the English who had done so much for them. Unhappily, however, Mauritius became a sugar-producing colony, and rum was made from the refuse of the sugar-mills. What was to be done with it? It was not good enough for European markets, and Madagascar 'was made the receptacle for the damaged spirit of the colony!' They received the curse in their simplicity, and it produced frightful havoc. 'The crime of the island rose in one short year by leaps and bounds to a height too fearful to record.' The native Government was seized with consternation, and the able and courageous King, Radama I., paid

Zanzibar, another prominent island, is commercially important as the base of supply and point of departure for the expeditions organized to penetrate the equatorial parts of the continent from the east coast. Speaking of it, Prof. Drummond says: "Oriental in its appearance, Mohammedan in its religion, Arabian in its morals, this cess-pool of wickedness is a fit capital for the dark continent. But Zanzibar is Zanzibar simply because it is the only apology for a town on the whole coast."[1]

SOUTH AFRICAN COUNTRIES.

Cape Colony.—The magnitude of the wine interests of the southern extremity of Africa, or Cape regions, is well known. M. Tisserand, in 1884, estimated Cape Colony's annual vintage at 15,400,000 imperial gallons. This, however, was probably an over-estimate. The "Weltwirthshaft" for 1884 credited Cape Colony with only 4,490,890 gallons. Official returns for 1887 showed that about 5,586,608 gallons of wine and 1,390.052 gallons of brandy were produced in 1887, the exports of wine being valued at £18,928. Climate and soil are eminently adapted for the cultivation of the grape, and it is claimed that the number of gallons to the acre averages higher than in any other country. The vine was one of the first European plants introduced at the Cape. The great success of the Cape wines in the early part of this century has not been maintained; the manufacturers have offended fastidious tastes by a too free use of spirits in "fortifying" their goods. Although the oïdium and phylloxera have crippled the vineyards, efforts are being made to revive the reputation of the Cape brands, and it is claimed that the wine interest there is only in its infancy, great tracts of rich land not having been utilized for viniculture as yet.

Natal.—In Natal the sugar-cane is widely cultivated, and in 1884 the plantations produced 18,771 tons, of which more than a third was exported to the Boers; from what remained rum was distilled, 2,200,000 gallons being obtained. By a regulation adopted in 1856 it is a penal offense to sell or give alcoholic drinks to the natives in Natal, but this law is frequently violated.

Basutoland.—There is a similar prohibition (similarly violated) in force in Basutoland, situated between Natal and the Orange Free State. At first it applied only to the native chiefs, who, having to act as judges, were expected to keep perfectly sober; but now neither chiefs nor native subjects can procure liquor lawfully. Prohibition in Basutoland was established by the decree of the Chief Moshesh, Nov. 8, 1854 (repeated by him in 1859), as follows:

> "*Whereas*, the strong drink of the whites was unknown to the progenitors of our tribe, Matie, Motlomi, up to Bo Monageng; and our father Mockachane, now advanced in years, never used anything for his drink save water and milk; and inasmuch as we are of opinion that a good chief and judge who uses anything to intoxicate him is not in a proper state to act as in duty bound; and since strong drink causes strife and dissension and is a cause of destruction of society (the strong drink of the whites is nothing else but fire):
>
> "Be it hereby made known to all that the introduction and sale of the said drink into the country of the Basutos is forbidden from this forward, and if anyone, white or colored, shall act in opposition to this interdict, the drink will be taken from him and spilled on the ground, without apology or compensation. And this decree shall be printed in the Basuto and Dutch languages, and be posted upon all the places of public resort, and in the villages of the Basutos.
>
> "Given with the advice and consent of the great of our tribe, being as the Chief of the Basutos, at Thaba, Bosigo, Nov. 8, 1854.
>
> "MOSHESH, Chief."[2]

Bechuanaland.—A native proclamation, equally remarkable with that of Moshesh, and antedating it by 17 years, was issued by Moroka, a Chief of Bechuanaland, and published in *Graham's Town Journal* (Cape of Good Hope), for March 22, 1838, as follows:

> "THABA 'NOHU, BECHUANALAND. — *A Law Prohibiting the Traffic in Ardent Spirits*: Whereas, the introduction of ardent spirits into this country has, in a great measure, been subversive

---

the duty and ordered every cask of rum to be staved in on the shore, except those that went to the Government stores. The merchants of Mauritius complained; the English officials interfered; and from that day the 'cursed stuff' has had free course, and deluged the land with misery and crime. Radama's son, Radama II., a youth of great promise, became a helpless drunkard and a criminal maniac, and was assassinated, after a reign of nine months, by order of his own Privy Council. Drunkenness is considered a European fashion, and in spite of the grief of the native authorities, 'this crying injury to a perishing people remains unredressed and unheeded by the most humane and Christian nation in the world. The same story may be told, with very slight variation of detail, of all the native tribes on the east African seaboard.'"

[1] Tropical Africa, by Henry Drummond, LL. D., F. R. S. E. (New York, 1890), p. 8.

[2] Temperance History, by Dawson Burns, D.D. (London National Temperance Publication Depot), vol. 1, pp. 377, 435.

of the good effects both of religious and civil government in every part where it has been allowed, and immediately caused disorder, immorality and vice, and more remarkably, poverty and distress, demoralization and destruction of life, by incessant depredations upon the property and rights of the weaker tribes of these parts: Be it hereby known that the traffic in ardent spirits in every part of the country under my government shall, from the date hereof, be illegal; and any person or persons found transgressing this my law shall be subject to the confiscation of all the spirits thus illegally offered for sale, with all other property of every kind belonging to the person or persons thus found transgressing that may be on the spot at the time of the seizure and in any way connected with the same.

"Given at Thaba 'nohu, this eighteenth day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty-seven. The mark X of Moroka, Chief of the Borolongs."

Kama, another Chief of Bechuanaland, said to a British official: "I fear Lo Bengula less than I fear brandy. I fought with Lo Bengula when he had his father's great warriors from Natal, and drove him back, and he never came again, and God, who helped me then, would help me again. Lo Bengula never gives me a sleepless night. But to fight against drink is to fight against demons, and not against men. I dread the white man's drink more than all the assegais of the Matebele, which kill men's bodies, and it is quickly over; but drink puts devils into men, and destroys both their souls and their bodies forever. Its wounds never heal."

In the trade of Delagoa Bay brandy is a chief article of import, and in the southern part of Delagoa the traders rely upon spirits more than any other commercial medium in their transactions with the natives, from whom they receive hides, caoutchouc, beeswax, etc., in exchange for the vilest rum.

THE CONGO FREE STATE.

No part of Africa has attracted so much attention in recent years as the vast region called the Congo Free State. It has an area of 780,000 square miles, contains a population of 43,000,000 people and embraces about one-half the entire basin of the Congo river. The most enterprising efforts have been and are being made to develop its commercial resources. The interests of civilization within its limits were the subject of careful and prolonged consideration by an International Conference, which met in Berlin, Nov. 15, 1884, at the invitation of Prince Bismarck. Representatives from 14 nations were present, and regulations for the government of the Congo Free State were established. These included a rigid prohibition of the slave trade, but the traffic in intoxicating liquors was in no way disturbed. Yet it was known to everybody that this traffic meant enslavement and speedy death to millions of Africans. The horrors wrought by the deadly liquor of the whites had been vividly described. Henry M. Stanley had said in "The Congo" (vol. 2, p. 252):

"With us on the Congo, where we must work and bodily movement is compulsory, the very atmosphere seems to be fatally hostile to the physique of men who pin their faith to whiskey, gin and brandy. They invariably succumb, and are a constant source of expense. Even if they are not finally buried out of sight and out of memory, they are so utterly helpless, diseases germinate with such frightful rapidity, symptoms of insanity are numerous; and, with mind vacant and body semi-paralyzed, they are hurried homeward to make room for more valuable substitutes."

The failure of the Berlin Congress to legislate against the liquor traffic in the Congo Free State is the theme of a most interesting and powerful book by W. T. Hornaday, entitled "Free Rum on the Congo" (New York, 1887). We quote as follows from Mr. Hornaday:

"In the whole of this high and mighty Act [the General Act of the Conference], there is not the slightest mention of any restriction on the trade in intoxicating liquors, or the promotion of temperance, or of any method or system whatsoever by which the condition of the people should be benefited in any way. . . So far as the improvement of the African people was concerned, or the interests of the Congo Free State furthered, the Conference might just as well have never been held. Judged by the result, we may thruthfully say that it was a Conference for trade only, and it is simply disgraceful that the spirit of trade, gain, pecuniary advantage and international greed should have so completely monopolized the deliberations of the Conference and the declarations of the Act. . . . But, it may be replied, the Government of the Congo Free State can itself pass laws for the protection of the people. Let me tell you it can do no such thing in regard to the traffic in liquor. The importation and sale of brandy, rum, gin, whiskey and alcohol is 'trade,' and the Great Powers (great in greediness) have decreed in the strongest terms that trade shall be *absolutely free* in that region. Rum has the right of way by international edict, and the International Association cannot stop the sale of a single bottle of it without the consent of the Powers.

If the opium growers of India want to send opium to the Congo and teach all the natives to use it, they can do so." (Pp. 63-65.)

And again, in the introduction to his little book, Mr. Hornaday's arraignment is even more severe:

> "It is amazing that the representatives of any enlightened nation could insist upon regulations allowing the exportation of poisonous brandy to Africa in an unlimited quantity, and free of all duty. The result of the Berlin West African Conference, when stripped of its diplomatic drapery, was simply this: the trading nations gave themselves a free entry into the country; by their accursed free trade enactments they utterly pauperized the Government of the Congo Free State (as a reward for the efforts of the International African Association in opening up the country !), and they fastened the free rum traffic upon the people for twenty years." (Pp. 5 and 6.)

Again:

> "Nearly all the savage tribes accept the virtues of civilization at retail and the vices at wholesale. . . . In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, his [the savage's] first news of the Christian world is brought by a trader, who also brings him fire-water and gunpowder. . . . Our civilization, as it stands at present, is a wholesale extermination of savage races. They are killed off by intemperance and modern diseases of various kinds, which are introduced among them by unprincipled Europeans, aided by other causes, less reprehensible but no less deadly, which spring from the same source.
>
> "Africa is being opened up from all sides, but to what ? To Portuguese slave-traders for one thing, and also to New England rum, Holland gin, poisonous brandy from Hamburg, Portuguese aguardiente, and deadly alcohol from France, and God only knows where else." (P. 37.)
>
> "By reason of the total absence of restraining laws heretofore, and the special privilege granted by the General Act of the Berlin Conference, the traders of Holland, Germany, Portugal, the United States, France and England are pouring cheap and deadly liquors into Africa by the shipload. The natives have developed an appetite for it almost beyond the power of belief, and it is used for currency instead of money. In fact, gin is the lever by which Africa is being 'opened up.'" (P. 71.)

The Netherlands, Germany, the United States, Great Britain, France, Spain and Portugal are the principals engaged in the production of liquors for the Congo traffic. The exportation of spirits from the Netherlands to the west coast of Africa, upon the authority of Mr. Hornaday, who gives statistics derived from official sources, amounted in 1883 to 848,578 gallons, in 1884 to 1,223,914 gallons and in 1885 to 1,087,562 gallons. Great Britain's exports of spirituous liquors to West Africa for 1885 aggregated 224,873 gallons. France's contribution for 1885 was 405,944 gallons. Germany's liquor exports to the Congo and other parts of Africa during 1885 reached the enormous quantity of 7,823,042 gallons. From the port of Boston, United States, during the five months of July and October, 1885, and January, February and June, 1886, 737,650 gallons of rum were exported to Africa.

W. P. Tisdel, a special United States agent sent to the Congo to examine the country and its inhabitants, in his report published in the Consular reports for 1885 (p. 334), says of the Congo gin business:

> "The gin comes mainly from Holland, and is manufactured expressly for the trade. The Holland article comprises about 90 per cent. of all the gin imported. The remaining 10 per cent. may be distributed amongst other countries."

When Mr. Hornaday wrote his book he made this prediction: "Ten years from now it will be too late to offer the Africans any protection from the evils that are now being sown amongst them." Four years have passed, but at the time this is written there is no certainty of a change of policy. Earnest and persevering efforts have been made by philanthropists and temperance people to arouse the governments to action, and the Brussels Conference of 1890 took favorable steps, prohibiting the traffic in distilled spirits throughout a broad zone; but the opposition of Holland has been interposed to prevent ratification. (See foot-note, p. 498.)

LIBERIA AND OTHER COUNTRIES OF THE WEST COAST.

The other countries of the west coast of Africa are also deluged with European and American spirits. In the Republic of Liberia, which is regarded with peculiar interest by Americans, the regulation of the drink traffic by license laws has been attempted. John H. Smith, United States Consul-General to Liberia, in 1885, reported that "no spirits have been brought into the Republic during the year on account of the opposition to the license law." Rev. B. F. Kephart, an American missionary to Liberia, wrote in 1889:

> "I never saw such poverty among God's people as there is in Liberia. . . . The Christian nations are pouring rum and gin in upon this poor people. The steamer that

brought us from Hamburg had on board 10,000 casks of rum (each holding 50 to 60 gallons), 11 cases of gin, 460 tons of gunpowder, and 14 missionaries—all on their way to Africa to convert the heathen. The German line has nine steamers that ply monthly between Germany and Africa. They always have the same kind of a load, with the exception of the missionaries. I learned that much of this rum came from Boston."[1]

Joseph Thomson, the African traveler, in an article entitled "Up the Niger," printed in *Good Words* for January, 1886, speaks thus of the enormous quantities of liquors poured into the coast ports and destined for the natives of the Niger Valley:

"At each port of call one becomes bewildered in watching the discharge of thousands of cases of gin, hundreds of demijohns of rum, box upon box of guns, untold kegs of gunpowder and myriads of clay pipes, while it seems as if only by accident a stray bale of cloth went over the side."

"The Earth and Its Inhabitants" (vol. 3, p. 127) contrasts the suppression of slavery in Senegambia with the continuance of the liquor traffic, and says:

"If men are no longer directly purchased, the European dealers continue the work of moral degradation. While reproaching the Negro populations with cruelty, they incite them to war; while complaining of their intemperate, depraved, or indolent habits, they persist in supplying them with fiery alcoholic drinks."

In Angola, just south of the Congo river, although there are some 32 distinct varieties of the grape, not wine-production but spirit-distillation is a leading industry. Spirits are made by the Portuguese from the sugar-cane. In Benguela, Mossamedes and nearly the whole of the Portuguese territory of West Africa, distilling is systematically carried on, the atrocious product being used in trade with the natives of the interior. The United States special agent to the Congo, W. P. Tisdel, from whom we have already quoted, declares in the Consular Reports for 1885 (p. 336), that "in St. Paul de Loando, Benguela, and Mossamedes there are no manufactories in the country, excepting for rum; consequently everything but the commonest articles of food is required from abroad."

African Methodist Episcopal Church.—The General Conference, representing 2,000 ministers and over 400,000 members, at Indianapolis, Ind., May, 1888, adopted resolutions as follow:

"RESOLVED 1, That we discourage the manufacture, sale and use of all alcoholic and malt liquors.

"RESOLVED 2, That we discourage the use of tobacco by our ministers and people.

"RESOLVED 3, That we discourage the use of opium and snuff.

"RESOLVED 4, That we indorse the great Prohibition movement in this country, also the work done by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and will use all honorable means to suppress the evils growing out of intemperance.

"RESOLVED 5, That it shall be a crime for any minister or member of the A. M. E. Church to fight against temperance, and if convicted of this crime he shall lose his place in the Conference and church."

The Committee on Temperance recommended (1) that unfermented wine be used at the Lord's Supper, and (2) that no habitual user of tobacco or whiskey be appointed a traveling preacher. The Bishops said in their address:

"We should allow no minister or member who votes, writes, lectures or preaches to uphold the rum trade to retain his membership, either in the Conference or the church. And those who are addicted to strong drink, either ministers or laymen, should have no place among us. Visit our station-houses, bridewells, jails, almshouses and penitentiaries, and you will there witness the effects of this horror of horrors. Rum has dug the grave of the American Indian so deep that he will never be resurrected. If we would escape the same fate as a church and a race we must be temperate . . . Some of the loftiest intellects have been blasted and blighted by this terrible curse. The use of wine at weddings should never be encouraged by our ministers; it is often the beginning of a blasted life."

African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church.—The General Conference, at its quadrennial session, held at New Berne, N. C., May, 1888, composed of ministers and laymen representing all the Annual Conferences of 29 different States, and a membership of 300,000, declared, in part:

"This General Conference re-affirms its stand against intemperance and the use of intoxicating liquors in any form as a beverage. We favor every means that can be brought to bear for the destruction of the traffic in all intoxicating drinks as a beverage in State and nation. We also heartily recommend that unfermented wine be used in the sacramental service as far as possible."

Alabama.—See INDEX.

Alaska.—See INDEX.

Alcohol.—"The intoxicating ingredient in all spirituous liquors, including under this term wines, porter, ale, beer, cider and every other liquid which has undergone the vinous fermentation."[1] Its production depends exclusively upon the decomposition of vegetable or animal matter: so far as is known it is impossible to obtain alcohol without decomposition. The strength of any intoxicating beverage is determined by the percentage of alcohol contained in it. Pure alcohol can be procured only by the processes of distillation and rectification. In its natural state it is a colorless, transparent liquid, closely resembling water in appearance. Chemically it is composed of 52.67 parts of carbon, 12.90 parts of hydrogen and 32.43 parts of oxygen; and the chemical formula for it is $C_2 H_6 O$. This is the ordinary alcohol forming the basis of genuine liquors, called ethylic alcohol, which has a specific gravity of 0.794 at 60° F. and boils at 173.1° F. But other alcohols are obtained by distillation, especially *methyl* alcohol ($C H_4 O$), which is derived from wood, is less intoxicating than the ordinary article but disagreeable to the taste, and is very extensively used in the arts and manufactures, because of its comparative cheapness. The remaining alcohols are the *propylic* ($C_3 H_8 O$), *butylic* ($C_4 H_{10} O$), *amylic* ($C_5 H_{12} O$), etc. These are all heavier than the ethylic, and a higher heat is required to generate them from the grain or other substance distilled: they are far more intoxicating than the ordinary alcohol and of deadly nature, and a conscientious distiller will use the utmost pains to prevent their presence in his liquors; but considerable quantities of them are produced even by the most carefully-managed processes, and thorough treatment is required to eliminate them. (For further information concerning the heavier alcohols, see DISTILLATION.)

---

[1] The *Voice*, Dec. 5, 1889.

The chemists of the Middle Ages, who first distilled alcohol—for to them its discovery is attributed by historical documents, although there is ground for believing that the Chinese understood the art long before—called the fluid by various names: *aqua ardens, aqua fortis, vinum ardens, vinum adustum, spiritus ardens, aqua vitæ*, etc. The name "*aqua vitæ*" (water of life) was considered especially appropriate by those who believed in its wondrous virtues. The word "alcohol" is said by some students to have been derived from the Arabic *al* ("the") and *kohl* ("fine," or "exceedingly fine and subtle"). Others assert that because of its evil effects upon men it was called *al ghole* (Arabic for "the evil ghost or spirit"). According to others, alcohol is corrupted from the Arabic *al ghûl* ("destruction," "calamity").[2] At first the production and use of distilled spirits were confined to the laboratory; but by degrees the knowledge of their highly intoxicating properties and the credulous belief in their medicinal qualities created the wide-spread demand for them that has prevailed for more than three centuries.

Legitimate Uses.—Alcohol in its concentrated form is not used as a beverage, except occasionally by the most desperate drinkers, who will eagerly swallow any decoction to gratify their burning thirst. Its legitimate uses are numerous and important. Large quantities, chiefly of methylated alcohol (i. e., the ordinary ethyl alcohol mixed with methyl alcohol or wood spirits), are employed by the manufacturers of varnishes, India rubber, candles, collodion and other articles. Alcohol is also of great value as a solvent, and is extensively used to dissolve fatty substances, essential oils, organic acids, etc. Ethers are formed by distilling mixtures of alcohol and acids; chloral and chloroform are produced by distilling, respectively, chlorine and chloride of lime with alcohol—and thus alcohol is an important agent in the manufacture of anæsthetic preparations. Vinegar is made by exposing fermented fruit juices to the air, the oxygen changing the alcohol to acetic acid, which constitutes from 2 to 4 per cent. of ordinary vinegar. The inflammability of alcohol and the intense heat resulting from its combustion make it very serviceable in mechanical and other operations where concentrated heat is required. Its resistance to cold is so great that it has never been obtained in a solid state, and at the very lowest temperatures it retains the fluid form though becoming viscid; hence it is substituted for mercury in thermometers used for indicating temperatures below the freezing point of mercury (—39° F.). Alcohol is one of the most precious of antiseptics, and any animal substance immersed in it can be preserved for an indefinite period of time.

---

[1] United States Dispensatory.

[2] See "The Foundation of Death" (New York, 1887), pp. 32–3.

Comparative Insignificance of the Quantity of Alcohol Used in the Arts, Manufactures, etc.—But the aggregate quantity of alcohol used for legitimate purposes is insignificant when compared with that entering into alcoholic liquors and drank by the people. W. F. Switzler, Chief of the United States Bureau of Statistics, in 1887, made some interesting inquiries to determine what portion of the alcoholic product is employed in the arts, manufactures, etc. These inquiries resulted in a statement from James A. Webb & Son, of New York, a firm receiving and handling most of the spirits used in the arts and manufactures in this country. Webb & Son declared that "the proportion of distilled spirits so used will not exceed 10 per cent. of the whole production," and that "90 per cent. of the whole product retained in the United States for consumption during the year is used as a beverage and is designated as rye or bourbon whiskey, gin, proof spirits, pure spirits, French spirits and high proof spirits." It is believed by those who have given special attention to the subject that Webb & Son have overestimated rather than underestimated the proportion of distilled spirits used in the arts and manufactures.[1] It will be understood, of course, that whatever estimate is accepted, no account is taken of fermented liquors: the entire product of beer and wine may be said to be used for beverage purposes and therefore to play no part whatever in the arts and manufactures.[2] That is, accepting Webb & Son's estimate, the quantity of alcohol used in the arts and manufactures, etc., in the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, was 10 per cent. of the quantity of distilled spirits produced during that year (91,133,550 gallons), or 9,113,355 gallons; while 82,020,195 gallons of spirits and 778,715,443 gallons of fermented liquors were produced as drink.

Practically all the distilled liquors in general use in the United States, save genuine whiskey, are obtained by compounding raw alcohol with different substances so as to give the particular liquors desired. Genuine whiskey is not a product of the compounding process, but is distilled from the grain direct. But by far the largest part of beverage spirits exists originally as concentrated alcohol, and receives commercial recognition as brandy, rum, whiskey, gin, etc., only after the raw article has been diluted and "doctored," frequently with the most poisonous drugs. The alcohol used in the compounding of such drinks is highly condensed to save freight charges, and is commercially known as "high proof spirits." The term "proof spirits" signifies, in the United States, an alcoholic strength of 50 per cent.

Percentages of Alcohol in Alcoholic Liquors.—The percentages of alcohol contained in some of the leading fermented and strong liquors are as follows:[3]

Beer	4.0	Lisbon	18.5
Porter	4.5	Canary	18.8
Ale	7.4	Sherry	19 0
Cider	8.6	Vermouth	19.0
Perry	8.8	Cape	19.2
Elder	9.3	Malmsey	19.7
Moselle	9.6	Marsala	20 2
Tokay	10.2	Madeira	21.0
Rhine	11 0	Port	23.2
Orange	11.2	Curacoa	27.0
Bordeaux	11.5	Aniseed	33.0
Hock	11.6	Chartreuse	43.0
Gooseberry	11.8	Gin	51.6
Champagne	12.2	Brandy	53.4
Claret	13.3	Rum	53 7
Burgundy	13.6	Irish Whiskey	53.9
Malaga	17 3	Scotch "	54.3

[The processes for obtaining the different alcoholic liquors are treated under the heads, BREWING, DISTILLATION and FERMENTATION. Descriptions of particular liquors will be found under MALT LIQUORS, SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS and VINOUS LIQUORS. The various controverted questions involved in the alcohol discussion are considered in the proper places; for instance, see ALCOHOL, EFFECTS OF; FOOD and MEDICINE.]

---

[1] The comparative insignificance of the quantity so used is explained by the very high tax (90 cents per gallon) levied by the United States Government on all spirits. Manufacturers and others who would use alcohol extensively in their business if it could be procured cheaply are forced to substitute less expensive articles for it. See CONSUMPTION OF LIQUORS; also footnote, p. 615.

[2] It is true, however, that wine and beer are extensively prescribed for medicinal purposes, so-called, while some fermented wine is consumed at the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Fermented liquors so used are said to be applied legitimately in the same sense that spirits entering into the arts and manufactures are so applied. But it is maintained by a constantly increasing number of physicians that there is no necessity or justification for administering *alcoholic liquors* of any kind to patients; and that even admitting alcohol to have medicinal value, all purposes may be better served by giving doses of *pure distilled alcohol* to patients than by providing them with draughts of any of the popular alcoholic beverages. From this point of view the quantity of beer and wine consumed for so-called medicinal purposes is to be classed with beverage liquors rather than with alcohol used in the arts, manufactures, etc.

[3] Mulhall (1886).

Alcohol, Effects of.—When we use the word alcohol we require to be clear as to the meaning of the word and the thing. We know now that the term is employed by the chemists to indicate a long series of chemical bodies, having certain properties in common and exhibiting the same chemical constitution in respect to the elements which enter into the composition of them. These elements, three in number—carbon, hydrogen and oxygen—never vary except in quantity or amount, and one of them, the oxygen, remains always the same, even in amount, in every member of the family. The other two elements, the hydrogen and the carbon, invariably present, exist in different quantities in different members of the family, and it is on this difference that the family differences depend. In the first or primary member of the family, the elements stand in the following form: there is one proportion or part of carbon, four of hydrogen and one of oxygen. This alcohol, called *methylic* alcohol or wood spirits, is a light fluid which boils at 140° Fahrenheit, and is so far volatile that I have succeeded in putting warm-blooded animals to sleep by making them inhale its vapor. We have in this methylic alcohol the lightest of the family group. If we pass to the thirtieth of the group we find a solid alcohol, called *melytic*, or by some, *melissic*, really a wax-like substance. The proportion of oxygen is just the same in this variety as in the last-named, but the proportions of carbon and of hydrogen have so greatly changed that the change in the quality of the substance need not be wondered at. The heavy element, carbon, has increased from one part in the *methylic* alcohol to 30 in the *melytic*, and the hydrogen has risen to 61. If we go back in the series we shall find another alcohol, the fifth from the methylic, called usually *amylic* alcohol, fusel oil, or, sometimes, potato spirits. This is a heavy oily fluid of disagreeable odor and of high boiling point, 270° Fahrenheit. It differs from the wood spirits in its weight, being very much heavier. It is composed of five parts of carbon and 12 of hydrogen, with the usual unit of oxygen.

The variations here noticed extend all through the series, and all through in regular sequence, the carbon increasing one part and the hydrogen two parts each step. If we could add one more of carbon and two more of hydrogen to methylic alcohol we should get another alcohol composed of two parts of carbon, six parts of hydrogen and one part oxygen, and this would be the common alcohol of commerce, *ethylic* alcohol, the spirit which forms the staple of all the wines, spirits, ales and other so-called spirituous drinks supplied in such large quantities to our communities for drinking purposes. All the alcohols are products or results of fermentation of one or other fermentable substance. The common or ethylic alcohol is the product of the fermentation of grain and of fruit, and is by far the largest product of any, because, by what has become the almost universal consent of the civilized world, it has been and is demanded as a beverage and stimulant. We may say of it, practically, that it alone is the alcoholic drink of those who indulge in the use of a stimulant; for although it is true that amylic alcohol and some other alcohols get mixed by accident, or carelessness, or it may be sometimes by design, with common alcohol, they are not supposed to be present in it, and the general effects of alcoholic drinking are attributable to it alone.

DIFFUSION OF ALCOHOL THROUGH THE BODY.

With the few facts above stated clearly before us on the position of common alcohol, from a chemical point of view, we may turn to the study of the *effects* of it on man and other living things subjected to its influence. For all living things it has a certain physical affinity, for the simple reason that all living things contain, and as a rule are largely made up of *water*, for which the alcohol has a strong affinity. Itself a mobile fluid, it mixes with water in all proportions and with the utmost readiness: in fact, it is by virtue of this readiness that it is received into the body. No one would ever learn to drink alcohol, under any circumstances, unless it were first largely diluted with water, as it is in wine, beer, brandy, rum, gin, whiskey and other spirits. When in any of these it is present in great strength, it is again diluted by the addition of more water, because if it were not so diluted it would create a burning sensation in the mouth and throat and would inflict serious injury on the stomach. Diluted with water it enters the body of man or animal with the water, and soon diffuses through the body wherever there is water in the tissues. Thus, for a short time after a portion of alcohol has entered the body, and before it has had the opportunity of being removed, it can be detected in all the fluid secretions. The late Dr. Percy discovered it present in the fluid of the ventricles of the brain. I have found it in the same fluid, in the blood, in the urine, in the fluids which lave the serous membranes, and, in short, in all the fluids derived from the blood. With some of the tissues it maintains a very close affinity, especially with the tissues of the liver and the brain. So close is its affinity for the brain-substance that it becomes a most difficult, nay even an impossible task, to distill from brain-matter all the ethylic alcohol with which it can be saturated. Hence in confirmed alcoholic inebriates it becomes, veritably, part and parcel, so to say, of the cerebral organization.

The usual mode of taking alcohol into the living body is to imbibe it by the mouth, as a drink; but it can effectively be introduced in other ways. If it be diluted and injected into the cellular tissue, under the skin, it will be absorbed from there. I found by experiment that it is rapidly absorbed from the peritoneal surface of a lower animal when it is freely diluted with water. I also found that at a sufficiently high temperature the vapor of it could be made to enter the lungs in sufficient quantity to be absorbed from the lungs and to produce by its diffusion through the blood its specific effects. Lastly, I have known it to be absorbed by the skin in so distinctive a manner as again to prove its transmission through the blood to all parts. The easy and rapid diffusibility of alcohol through the body is the reason why its effects are so speedily realized after it has been received by the body, and it is on this account that it has gained so wide a popularity as a quick restorer. It seems to those who are wearied to restore the lost power so speedily that they are led to consider it a panacea in all cases of need or of emergency. How far this view is true we shall see better as we proceed.

PRIMARY OR ACUTE EFFECTS OF ALCOHOL ON THE BODY.

So soon as the diffusion of alcohol has been made through the system of a human being, effects are manifested. The effects are modified by the amount taken, and by some other circumstances, such as temperature of the air, the dilution of the spirit with water, and above all the habits of the person who has partaken of it, whether he be an abstainer from it habitually or one accustomed to it. But as a rule we may state that the action, varying in degrees under different circumstances, is exceedingly uniform and regular. The effects which ensue may emphatically be called *nervous* in character, that is to say, they are phenomena due to a disturbance emanating from the nervous centers, the centers of the sympathetic or organic nervous system, and afterwards from the centers of the voluntary nervous organism. The impression made through the stomach upon the organic nerves is exceedingly rapid, being manifested often within a few minutes after the alcohol has been imbibed, and becoming well developed in 20 minutes to half an hour. These first effects, extending through the nervous distribution to the whole of the vascular system, institute what I have called the first stage or degree of alcoholic disturbance, the stage of *paresis* of the arterial vessels to their extremities. These vessels, held naturally in a state of proper tension and of resistance to the stroke of the heart, become relaxed under the action of the alcohol, as a result of its interference with the function of the organic nerves which follow these vessels to their extremities and attune their muscular contraction so as to permit the necessary quantity of blood to make its course through them. The quantity of blood thrown out by the stroke of the heart is treated with less resistance than is natural in every part where blood circulates, beginning with the circulation of the blood through the heart itself and extending to the circulations through the brain, through the visceral organs—like the stomach, intestines and liver—as well as through the active organs of locomotion, the groups of muscles that move the body. The result is that action through every part and organ of the body that is capable of action which can be felt, as well as of parts in which action is not sensibly felt—such as the involuntary muscles—is for the moment intensified, and phenomena are induced which are strictly indicative of the over-action. The heart is quickened in its beat, and owing to the checked flow of blood through itself the force of its beat is also increased. The vessels of the surfaces of the body, like those of the skin and mucous membranes, are injected with blood — a fact evidenced in the increased redness of the skin which is always seen during this stage. The mind becomes a little exalted, and ideas seem to flow more freely. The larger quantity of warm blood sent into the skin communicates a sensible glow, which feels to the person affected like an increased warmth of body generally. The secretions of the different visceral glands are increased. The muscles appear to be endowed with renewed power, and, taking all the phenomena experienced into account, it really seems, on a superficial view, as if during this stage all the vital powers were being carried on with an advanced vitality. The feeling is as pleasant as it is delusive, as cheering as it is deceptive.

It is not until we come to measure up the effects of this first stage with the precision of an observer who is looking at the phenomena without feeling them, that the truth is made manifest. Then it comes out clearly that the over-action felt, subjectively, is waste without compensation—lost energy, and so lost that in no sense whatever is it regained. If at the moment when the over-action is at its height the muscular power be tested, it will be found wanting. By a beautiful series of experiments, Dr. Ridge has demonstrated that if at this particular time of over-action the refined involuntary muscular movements be tested, they are in the most uncertain condition for action. The sense of delicate touch for balancing weights is made absolutely worthless; sensibility of touch is rendered imperfect; the adjustment of the muscles of vision is made uncertain and feeble, so that the act of aiming at a mark is extremely faulty; and the sense of hearing faint sounds is decisively impaired. These facts relate to the action of the *involuntary* muscles, but they apply with equal correctness to the voluntary. I myself studied, with the greatest care, the effects of alcohol during the first stage of its action on the voluntary muscles, not only of man but of inferior animals; and I detected invariably that, other things being equal, the actual strength of the voluntary muscles is reduced under alcoholic excitement, except for the briefest moments, in which no sustained work is being carried out.

Precisely the same state of things is observable in respect to mental phenomena. The mind seems more active, and may be so, but it is less precise and less strong in its efforts. Words, which come forth at one moment in haste, are forgotten the next, or refuse to come into remembrance, and in the art of spelling words the greatest confusion is often apt to prevail. To these failures of mind, excitement of mind is often an accompaniment followed by depression and irritability. To sum up, the first degree of effect from alcohol is towards helplessness of mind and body when the full influence is calculated. What seems good about it is delusive; what seems bad is definitely bad, and admits of scarcely any qualification.

The first stage or degree passing away may leave nothing more than a depression, but if it has been induced by a quantity of alcohol which leads to an extension of symptoms, then a second stage or degree is evidenced, in which all the signs of failure are more strikingly portrayed. In this second degree the worst indications of the first are exaggerated, and the failures of muscular precision and power and of mental equilibrium are much advanced. In this degree the *voluntary* muscles begin to show the same aberration that was instanced in the involuntary at an earlier period. The smaller voluntary muscles, like those of the lip, are, as a rule, the first to become enfeebled and uncertain. Afterwards the muscles of the limbs follow the imperfection of function, and the brain also becoming reduced in power the muscular and mental acts begin to be aberrant simultaneously. Meantime, in this degree, the temperature of the body begins to fall. The great surface of blood that has been exposed to the air in the first stage is now flowing more tardily and, receiving no sufficient supply of warmth from within the body, is cooling down, leaving all parts reduced in warmth like itself.

The second degree of alcoholic effect always leaves behind it considerable depression of body and of mind, even if not succeeded, as it may be, by a third degree from a still deeper dose of alcohol. This third degree, if it does ensue, is marked by a more complete prostration, by an entire want of proper control of the voluntary as well as of the involuntary muscles, by delirium and mental imbecility, and at last by complete collapse both of body and mind.

To this third stage of alcoholic depression there may succeed a fourth, in which there is absolute paralysis of the will, and of all voluntary muscular power. In this stage the mind, quite unconscious, is buried in the deepest coma or sleep. The body is now entirely anæsthetized, so that a surgical operation of the severest character might be performed on it without the slightest pain. In this stage also the temperature of the body, which has been falling through the whole of the third degree, sinks to the lowest point practically compatible with the continuance of life, namely to 92° or over 6° below what is natural. To such a low ebb, in short, has life been brought, that only two nervous centers remain true to their function, the center which presides over respiration and the center which stimulates the heart into motion. Upon the fidelity of these two centers, so acting until the body begins to be set free from the alcohol by its slow elimination recovery entirely depends, recovery always attended, under the most favorable conditions, by many hours and even days of depression and degradation of nutrition.

IS ANY GOOD DONE?

In the above description of the effects of alcohol on the body the acute effects alone have been considered. Before passing to a new point it may be well to make a note on one or two questions which the narrative suggests. The first question we are led to ask is, Whether in the course of the variation from the natural standard of vital actions which follow the action of alcohol to and through any degree, any good, useful or necessary thing has been done? The admitted answer to this question must on all sides be, that after the effects of the first degree have been obtained no good thing can have been done, while some amount of evil may have been effected. It is indeed accepted now by all authorities that the phenomena of alcoholism manifested in the primary and stimulating periods of its action are the only phenomena that can be productive of service. These are the phenomena of stimulation; and as they are well defined we can study them, one by one, and ask their value.

1. There is the phenomenon of *quickened circulation of the blood and quickened motion of the heart.* Is that good? It may be good to call a languidly acting heart into more vigorous motion, but to do this with the rest of the body in repose, by means of an internal stimulant, is certainly very bad practice. The heart that wants to be called into more action requires invigoration by reasonable exercise in which the other muscles of the body can share, not by exercise in which it alone is engaged. The heart stimulated alone soon begins to feel the habitual necessity of the special stimulant, and learning in time to depend upon its artificial support lives as it were upon that support; and becoming over-active and out of harmony with the rest of the organs of the body so long as it is supplied with its stimulant, it fails in the most lamentable manner if by any accident its stimulant be withdrawn. Here is the reason why even so-called temperate consumers of alcohol feel so acutely, at first, the withdrawal of alcohol. They feel as if they had lost blood, and numbers who try to abstain are driven back from the trial of abstinence because they have not the resolution to persevere until the heart learns to work without the artificial spur to its action. The spur all through is deceptive and bad. It takes the place of exercise without performing the proper duty. It produces derangement just bordering on disease of the heart. It often lays the foundation of actual disease of that organ, and it leads to inactivity of other functions of the body and to general inaptitude for the active duties of life until a stimulant has been taken. We cannot, therefore, count this part of the action of alcohol as a good action.

2. There is the phenomenon of *warmth* induced by the primary action of alcohol. Is that good? This warmth is always

ephemeral and is always followed by a corresponding fall of temperature. It is like the temporary increased heat of a fire under the action of the bellows: it quickens the glow but it does not sustain the steady burning of the fire. On the contrary, it really causes the fire to burn out more quickly without adding a grain to the fuel. It is impossible, consequently, to attach any value to alcohol as a warmer. It is positively a cooler of the blood and tissues, and combined with cold it expedites, in the most determinate manner, as my researches on the action of alcohol on pigeons showed, the fatal effects of extreme cold. The experiences of Arctic voyagers have proved the same in man.

3. There is experienced in those who are accustomed to alcohol a sense of *strength* after taking it, and of *firmness*, which seems to be a good preparation for acts requiring precision, strength or endurance. Is that good? To those who rely on the assurance given in this way by alcohol, this is considered not only as good but as a necessity. The best that can be truly said of it, however, is that it is an acquired good, an acquired necessity. In itself it is bad, because the greatest benefits which it confers are poor indeed when compared with the precision, the strength and the endurance experienced by those who, being untouched by the habit of relying on wine, are accustomed to depend purely on natural agencies for their maintenance of vital labors. In a word, it may be accepted with absolute certainty that whenever a person habituated to alcohol feels that he is unable to perform any work which he wishes to perform unless he resorts to alcohol for assistance, he is so far under its influence for evil as to be in positive danger from it and from its interference with his natural vitality.

Summing up all the effects produced by alcohol during the primary and least hurtful stage of its action, there is no effect from it that can be pronounced either good or necessary for the healthy body, no effect that cannot be supplied by more natural and better means—that is to say, by the aid of natural food and drink, neither of which alcohol can claim to be.

It is one of the most distinctive effects of alcohol that when the taste for it has once been acquired it makes for itself a special constitution which may most faithfully be designated the alcoholic constitution. When this constitution has once been formed it renders everything else subordinate to itself, according to the degree of alcoholic influence that has been established. Thus the person really temperate in the use of alcohol holds by his temperate habit as firmly as he who has established in himself the more dangerous habit of inebriety. These effects are purely physical, and they can be induced in animals inferior to man, by training, just as easily as in man himself. They are dependent on the affinity which alcohol has for the matter of the brain and the other nervous centers, in which centers it forms a habitat for itself, from which it can be removed only by long-continued total abstinence.

Many persons go on for years under the simple action of the moderate effect of alcohol; they are never affected beyond the first stage of its action, and always assume that they feel the benefit of it. Others who have got so far are tempted to go a little farther under some excitement, recreation, work, worry, or one of the many incentives for stimulation, and so work themselves into the habit of the second stage, which is less easy to restrain than the first. Others slip habitually into the habit of the third degree, become regularly intemperate and so fixed in intemperance that they are all but irreclaimable. From this last group spring those lowest in the series of the habitual alcoholics, who suffer from general paralysis and who fitly and literally represent the individual in the fourth degree of acute alcoholic intoxication, dead to the world under the extreme paralyzing influence of the spirit they have imbibed.

These four classes of mankind form the four great populations of constitutionally-alcoholized humanity that exists out of the bonds and bounds of childhood. It is fortunate that as yet the first years of human life have been so far exempted from the alcoholic spell, for by this circumstance a full sixth of the term of each life is largely saved from the injury and danger of alcohol. Yet even this more fortunate section is not altogether free; for, unhappily, an agent which, like alcohol, is capable of inflicting so marked an impression on the nervous centers, is also capable of inflicting impressions which pass from parent to offspring and which implant by inheritance the constitutional habit. The inheritance of disease thus acquired from alcohol is not so strong as that of some other diseased conditions from other causes, and it is not, according to my observation, transmitted farther than the third generation; but it must be admitted as a factor tending to the production of alcoholic degeneracy and to the increase of the great populations sharing in one or other of the constitutional stages of alcoholic existence, and in the induced series of aberrations from the natural standard of health which furnish the large class of disorders, bodily and mental, now designated as the alcoholic diseases of mankind.

INJURIES, PHYSICAL AND MENTAL.

It will be clear to every reasoning and unprejudiced mind that a chemical substance which possesses the power of producing in the living so many varied and important changes as those which alcohol produces, cannot fail to induce, in the organs of the body, physical modifications which are either good or bad. That alcohol is incapable of imparting any good is now pretty generally acknowledged. Its elementary construction precludes the possibility of considering it as a substance or food which can build up or sustain any vital structure or organ, such as muscle or brain; and when it is freed from saccharine foods there is no evidence whatever for assigning to it the doubtful virtue of giving fat to the body. In small quantities it quickens, in large quantities it deadens nervous action. This is its *summum bonum* and its *summum malum*. The good is infinitesimal—the evil infinite. The physical injuries from alcohol are incomparably large because of their extent. They graduate from the simple exaltation of action, peculiar to the excitement of the first degree of its action, to the complete paralysis pertaining to the last degree. Wherever organic matter of the body is enfolded in membrane, there will alcohol penetrate and there will functional disturbances followed by organic degeneration be set up. We know now of a definite and connected family of alcoholic degenerative diseases. We are acquainted with alcoholic *phthisis*, or the consumption of drunkards; with hepatic *cirrhosis*, or induration of the drunkard's liver; with the *dropsy* arising from the hepatic cirrhosis; with alcoholic *dyspepsia*; with alcoholic *epilepsy*; with alcoholic *hypertrophy*, or enlargement of the heart; with alcoholic *asthenia*, or feebleness of the heart; with *degeneration of the kidney* and the accompanying train of kidney diseases classed vaguely under the term Bright's Disease. But the most wide-spread devastations from alcohol are those seated in the nervous system and displayed in mental aberration. The commoner known of these are the acute affections, *delirium tremens*, *mania from drink*, *inebriety* or repeated intoxication, to which must be added the less understood yet serious conditions, *alcoholic epilepsy* and *alcoholic paralysis*. This last-named disease, only recently clearly defined, is one of the most wide-spread of the chronic diseases resulting from alcohol, one of the most obscure and one of the most fatal.

MORTALITY FROM ALCOHOL.

An agent like alcohol, extensively and recklessly used by mankind in all parts of the world, and capable of inducing so many and serious diseases, must of necessity be the cause of a tremendous mortality, with the usual precedence of many days of utter disablement and disease. That is the fact. It is difficult to calculate the precise mortality from alcohol, because we have never yet fully diagnosed all the evils leading to disease and death which spring from it. For example, up to this time we have not added the mortality due to alcoholic paralysis in the large computations from which our results have been drawn. Some years ago, from the best data I could obtain, I estimated that in England and Wales the annual mortality from alcohol was 50,000 per annum, an estimate fairly confirmed by other observers who have made inquiries of an important and independent character. Admitting its correctness, this estimate makes the mortality from alcohol to be about one-tenth of the whole mortality—a view which had previously been expressed by the late Dr.

Edwin Lankester, the Coroner for Central Middlesex—and places alcohol, as one of the causes of mortality, at the *head* of those causes. This estimate, however, must have been under the mark, since it excluded altogether that fatality which we now know to arise from alcoholic paralysis, and excluded also, too rigidly, instances of direct poisoning from alcohol and all accidents of a fatal kind indirectly due to alcohol. I would not, however, run any risk of being charged with overstatement, and would be content still to place the mortality from alcohol at one-tenth of the whole mortality, in places where the article is consumed in the same proportion as in England and Wales at the present time, a proportion fairly representative of alcoholic populations generally.

Connected with the two subjects of the diseases from alcohol and the mortality from it, the question has often been discussed as to the relative amount of sickness presented by abstaining as compared with non-abstaining communities, and as to the relative value of life in the two communities. It has been difficult to get at precise conclusions on these subjects from the two circumstances that in making comparisions the social relationships of the different classes are largely different, and the returns from the registers of death from alcohol have been hitherto imperfect in themselves and imperfect in the interpretations that have been put upon them. But judging from the reports of those life assurance companies in which there are two classes of insured—one an abstaining and the other a non-abstaining class—and judging likewise from the returns of sickness and mortality of two clubs, one abstaining and the other non-abstaining, existing in the same locality, holding the same social status, and made up of the same numbers, it is absolutely certain that the rate of mortality and the number of days of sickness present data largely in favor of abstaining communities.

In summary, as to the effects of alcohol on the health and life of the human species, on which fortunately those effects have alone been tried on a large scale, it must be stated on physical grounds, apart altogether from moral considerations, that the effects of alcohol are injurious, both to mind and body, that until it has produced an artificial constitution, alcohol does nothing that anyone can construe into useful action, and that the establishment of the alcoholic constitution is a false and unnatural policy of human life—a source of weariness, of disease, of premature old age, and of excessive and unnecessary mortality.

BENJAMIN WARD RICHARDSON.

Ale.—See MALT LIQUORS.

Amendments, Constitutional.—See CONSTITUTIONAL PROHIBITION.

Anti-Prohibition.—While recognizing the praiseworthy motives and commendable zeal of Prohibitionists, the anti-Prohibitionists oppose their aim and measures for the following reasons:

1. They consider Prohibition laws, including the prohibition of the sale and thus of the use of wine as a beverage, to be so opposed to public opinion that they could not be passed; or, if passed by some legislative accident, would never be enforced. In connection with this argument they consider the experiment in Kansas and Iowa too recent for deductions, and that in Maine to be a failure.

2. They consider the Prohibition of the sale and therefore the use of wine as a beverage, to be contrary to the teachings of Scripture. Of course they hold the two-wine theory to be a wild chimera of the brain.

3. They consider the denunciation of wine implied in such laws as a reflection on the Saviour, who made it the emblem of his salvation and who used it in his earthly life.

4. They consider that any such laws, which are counter to the public opinion and the public conscience, lead to the disorganization of the community by creating a contempt for law.

5. They believe that Prohibition laws would inevitably lead to the increase of law-breaking and drunkenness, and thus ruin the reform proposed. Any one would then sell, while now only a certain number are allowed to sell.

6. They believe that the sale should be restricted, and that Prohibition will not restrict.

7. They believe that wise and strong restrictive laws will receive the cordial approbation of the vast majority of the community, and that the Prohibition

movement is the greatest enemy to this needed reform.

8. They believe that the Prohibition movement, for the above reasons, is disgusting many, so that they take no interest in any temperance action. Prohibition is thus hindering moral effort.

9. They believe that all evils which are not in themselves crimes or sins should be remedied gradually, if the remedy is to be a permanent one.

10. They believe that the selling of liquor is not a crime or a sin, and that to class it with theft or murder is a gross fallacy.

11. They believe that the evils of liquor-selling are wholly in the excesses that have been connected with it, and that law should have regard only to those excesses. The crime or sin is in the excess and not in the selling.

12. They believe that certain forms and ways of liquor-selling, as especially dangerous, should for that reason come under the cognizance of the laws.

13. They believe that the justice of these sentiments is far more available to turn the public to a true temperance than the injustice of the Prohibitionist sentiments, which only exasperate men of good repute and enkindle opposition to all reform.

14. They believe that Prohibition, if temporarily successful in any locality, will produce a fearful re-action in which the moderate men, as they were ignored by the extremists for Prohibition, will be in like manner ignored by the extremists on the other side.

Howard Crosby.

Anti-Saloon Republican Movement.—A movement inaugurated in 1885 by Republican Prohibitionists of Kansas, for the purpose of inducing the Republican party everywhere to adopt "a platform of uncompromising hostility to the saloon;" pressed with considerable earnestness in different parts of the country by individual sympathizers; regarded, however, with but scant favor by the leaders and masses of the party, and practically abandoned after the Presidential campaign of 1888.

The defeat of Blaine, Republican candidate for President in 1884, was attributed by many to the large vote of the Prohibition party, and this was attributed to the unsatisfactory attitude of the Republicans on the temperance question. When the bitter feelings occasioned by the result had been somewhat soothed, numerous temperance advocates, firmly attached to the Republican organization, began to hope that the party in seeking ways and means for regaining power would show favor for their views.

Albert Griffin, then editor of the Manhattan (Kan.) *Nationalist*, issued a call, dated Dec. 1, 1885, for a National Convention of Republican foes of the liquor traffic, to meet at Toledo, O., May 19, 1886. The call was entitled "Destruction to Dramshops," was addressed to "Enemies of the Dramshop," and was signed by 146 persons, residents of 63 towns of Kansas. It declared that the time had come "when this issue must be squarely made and fought out," and that "the Republican party must and will mount a temperance platform." It invited the co-operation of all earnest temperance men, "provided they are working for the annihilation of the liquor traffic at the earliest possible moment," and closed by appealing to Republicans to "save the grand old party from disintegration." Half-way measures or compromising schemes were not contemplated by this call.

Mr. Griffin made a tour of the Eastern States, presenting his idea to prominent Republican leaders, and soliciting practical encouragement. He found, however, that the radical Kansas basis would not be acceptable to the responsible managers of the party. It was impossible, under these circumstances, to make the proposed National Convention a success. The Republican organ at Toledo, the *Blade*, although an outspoken opponent of the saloon (under the editorial management of D. R. Locke), regarded the movement with coldness and suspicion, and no State Convention was held to prepare for the proposed national meeting at Toledo. The original call was finally withdrawn, and a new call was issued, providing for a National Conference at Chicago on Sept. 16, 1886. This new call made material concessions to the timidity of party leaders, and defined the purposes of the movement in the following cautious language:

"In the opinion of those who called this National Conference, the party should not be asked to commit itself nationally to or against any specific law, but should announce as its settled policy that it will everywhere strive to reduce the business of dramselling and the evils resulting from it as much as possible, each State to decide for itself from time to time what laws are best adapted to secure the end in view; and that whenever the people express a desire to vote on Prohibitory Amendments they should be given an opportunity. But whatever is done should be done honestly and with such emphasis that the men engaged in the liquor business will recognize the party as their enemy, and leave its ranks. Nothing short of that will satisfy the temperance forces, and that line of policy need not, and, if properly managed will not, alienate the mass of drinking men, almost all of whom admit that the saloon is a deadly enemy to good order and every human interest. Some will, of course, leave us, but their ranks will in the near future be more than made up by temperance men of other parties who will join us until that issue shall be settled."

Despite the expressed dissatisfaction of many of the original signers, the elastic policy thus outlined was adhered to; and the Anti-Saloon Republicans manifested a very reasonable disposition in all the subsequent efforts that they made to control the party. Their failure was consequently all the more disappointing and significant.

The first State meeting held in support of their programme was for New Jersey, at Trenton, May 26, 1886. In a number of other States conferences met during the summer. The National Conference assembled at Chicago on the appointed day, Sept. 16, with about 200 delegates present. The tone of the Republican press was unfriendly. There was no suitable representation from the States except in two or three instances, and no very influential managers of party affairs were present. Vital demands made by the Prohibition element were rejected, particularly the demand that the party should favor the adoption of Prohibition. An objectionable declaration, recognizing taxation of the liquor traffic as a legitimate policy, was inserted in the platform. But there were many earnest and aggressive words spoken, especially by the Permanent Chairman, William Windom (Secretary of the Treasury under Garfield and afterwards under Harrison). Senator Henry W. Blair was Temporary Chairman of the Conference. The following is the platform adopted:

"*First.*—That the liquor traffic as it exists today in the United States is the enemy of society, a fruitful source of corruption in politics, the ally of anarchy, a school of crime, and with its avowed purpose of seeking to corruptly control elections and legislation is a menace to the public welfare and deserves the condemnation of all good men.

"*Second.*—That we declare war against the saloon, and hold it to be the supreme duty of the Government to adopt such measures as shall restrict it and control its influence, and at the earliest possible moment extinguish it altogether.

"*Third.*—We believe the National Government should absolutely prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia and in all the Territories of the United States.

"*Fourth.*—We believe the best practical method of dealing with the liquor traffic in the several States is to let the people decide whether it shall be prohibited by the submission of Constitutional Amendments, and until such Amendments are adopted, by the passage of Local Option laws.

"*Fifth.*—That inasmuch as the saloon business creates a special burden of taxation upon the people to support courts, jails and almshouses, therefore a large annual tax should be levied upon the saloons as long as they continue to exist, and that they should be made responsible for all public and private injury resulting from the traffic.

"*Sixth.*—That the Republican party, wherever and whenever in power, will faithfully enforce whatsoever ordinances, statutes or Constitutional Amendments may be enacted for the restriction or suppression of the liquor traffic.

"*Seventh.*—That we approve the action of Congress, and of those States that have done so, in providing for teaching the physiological effects of intoxicants in our public schools, and that we earnestly recommend to every State Legislature the enactment of such laws as shall provide for the thorough teaching of such effects to our children.

"*Eighth.*—We demand that the Republican party to which we belong, and whose welfare we cherish, shall take a firm and decided stand, as the friend of the home and the enemy of the saloon, in favor of this policy and these measures. We pledge ourselves to do our utmost to cause the party to take such a stand, and we call upon all temperance men and all friends of humanity of whatever party or name to join with us in securing these objects and in support of the Republican party so far as it shall adopt them"

No important results were brought about by the Chicago Conference. A National Committee was selected, with Albert Griffin as Chairman. It opened headquarters in New York, and some work was carried on. A few State meetings were held between September, 1886, and May, 1888, but the attendance was meagre in each instance, and the real leaders of the party could not be persuaded to exhibit active interest. The New York *Weekly Mail and Express* finally consented to become the formal organ of the movement, but very little sympathy or attention was bestowed by the press in general.

As the Presidential campaign of 1888 approached the Anti-Saloon Republicans prepared to test their strength in the national councils of the party. A second National Conference was called, to meet in New York, May 2 and 3, 1888. "The Anti-Saloon Republican movement," said the call for this body, "has now reached a magnitude and a momentum which nothing can withstand. It no longer pleads for a hearing. It commands compliance. It proposes to place the Republican party where it belongs, positively and finally on the side of the home and the public safety, as against the saloon system and its destructive work. . . . Speaking for an overwhelming majority of Republican voters and good citizens, we respectfully but most urgently ask our brethren of the Republican National Convention, which is to meet in Chicago in June, to incorporate in their platform of principles a declaration of hostility to the saloon as clear and as emphatic as the English language can make it. We ask this because it is right. Right is might." But this Conference was not well attended. There were no very important representatives of the party present, and the finance report showed that Mr. Griffin's Committee was hopelessly in debt. Nevertheless it was decided to make as good a fight as could be made at the coming National Convention of the Republican party in Chicago. Despite the complete defeat of the Anti-Saloon Republicans in that body,[1] the services of their organization were given to the National Republican managers in the Presidential contest.

Mr. Griffin conducted a campaign bureau, publishing and circulating documents which appealed to temperance people to support Harrison and Morton. This bureau was, however, in no way publicly connected with the Republican National Committee, Chairman Quay disclaiming responsibility for it; and Mr. Griffin was not permitted to carry on his work at the regular headquarters of the party, although a German and Anti-Prohibition bureau managed by a prominent "personal liberty" advocate was harbored there.

After the election the efforts to maintain an agitation were brought to an end. The New York *Weekly Mail and Express* continued for some months as the organ of the movement, and Mr. Griffin became its editor. But the proprietors of this newspaper, in July, 1889, perceiving the inconsistency of championing Prohibition while loyally supporting the actual policy of the Republican party, presented to Mr. Griffin the alternative of advocating High License and similar compromises or severing his connection with the paper. He stood by his principles, and with his retirement from the *Mail and Express* the national movement was practically terminated.

The Anti-Saloon Republicans, though never a strong factor in the Prohibition work, made important contributions to the discussion of political issues. There was a natural antagonism between them and the party Prohibitionists, and warm arguments were exchanged. A bitter spirit was manifested at times, especially in the editorials of the *Weekly Mail and Express* before Mr. Griffin assumed charge of that journal. Even the National Committee of the Anti-Saloon Republicans exhibited extreme rancor, and in one memorable address emanating from it the party Prohibitionists were derided as "a combination of misguided enthusiasts, moral peacocks, disgruntled politicians, mercenaries and cranks operating in the sacred name of temperance."

But the conscientiousness and earnestness of most of the representative Anti-Saloon Republicans were never questioned. Their arguments and efforts put many individuals to severe but wholesome tests. They were criticized for their concessions and tame acquiescence; but if, as Republicans seeking to convert their party organization, they had been more radical and less patient, their ultimate failure would not have been so instructive. The most important reason for their lack of success was expressed by Governor Foraker of Ohio, in a letter to Mr. Griffin. "We are straightout Republicans in Ohio," said he, "with entire confidence that the duly accredited representatives of the party in convention assembled will always best determine what the party should do." That is, the

---

[1] See Republican Party.

Anti-Saloon Republican movement was irresponsible and irregular, viewed from a strict party standpoint, and the practical politicians were not disposed to encourage a factional, loosely-connected, sentimental and unauthoritative organization.

Besides Mr. Griffin, some of the men most conspicuously identified with the cause were Henry B. Metcalf of Rhode Island, Major Z. K. Pangborn, editor of the Jersey City *Evening Journal*; H. K. Carroll, LL. D., of the *Independent;* Gen. A. B. Nettleton of Minnesota, Noah Davis of New York, Frank Moss of New York, Rufus S. Frost of Massachusetts, Liston McMillen of Iowa and Alexander S. Bacon of New York.

Anti-Slavery Parallel, The. —A marked similarity is observable in the movements against slavery and against the liquor evil in the United States. Slavery and the liquor traffic were intimately associated almost from the beginning. The traders who brought shiploads of slaves to America carried cargoes of rum to Africa. During the Revolutionary period the slave-trade and the liquor traffic alike provided themes for discussion and agitation. The early efforts for both reforms were very conservative. The first Anti-Slavery society did not propose Abolition, but was, as its name implies, a "Society for the relief of free negroes unlawfully held in bondage." Similarly the first temperance societies consisted of individuals pledged "to discountenance the too free use of ardent spirits," or "to restrain and prevent the intemperate use of intoxicating liquors."

In 1775 the first Abolition society was formed at Philadelphia, with Dr. Benjamin Franklin as President, and Dr. Benjamin Rush as Secretary.

Two years later the question of prohibiting whiskey-making came to the surface, the following resolution being passed by the Continental Congress at Philadelphia:

> "Resolved. That it be recommended to the several Legislatures in the United States immediately to pass laws the most effectual for putting an immediate stop to the pernicious practice of distilling grain, by which the most extensive evils are likely to be derived if not quickly prevented."

In 1785 the Manumission Society of New York City was formed, with John Jay as its President, to secure the freedom of slaves. That same year Dr. Benjamin Rush put forth his famous tract, "An Inquiry into the Effects of Ardent Spirits upon the Human Mind and Body," which created a profound sensation and led to the "Memorial of the College of Physicians to the Senate of the United States Congress," deprecating the use of ardent spirits and recommending the imposition of high duties upon their importation. This memorial was presented Dec. 29, 1790. Four years later, in 1794, the Quakers presented to Congress the first Anti-Slavery petition. Soon after this Abolition societies sprang into existence in various parts of the country as did also anti-liquor societies. As early as 1789 a number of farmers of Litchfield County, Conn., combined to do their agricultural work without recourse to spirituous liquors.

In 1805, at Allentown, N. J., the "Sober Society" was founded, and in 1808, at Moreau, N. Y., an organization believed to have been the first so-called "Temperance Society" was established. In 1816 a newspaper called the *Appeal* was started at St. Clairsville, O., to champion the Anti-Slavery cause. The movement against slavery languished for some years, but in 1831 new life was given to the agitation by William Lloyd Garrison's *Liberator*, and from that time forward the issue became of paramount importance. In 1834 President Jackson recommended to Congress the passage of an act suppressing Anti-Slavery literature. The Whig party opposed this radical measure, and many Abolitionists looked to that party to advocate their principles, much as Prohibitionists of a later day looked to the Republican party. In November, 1839, a number of Abolitionists met at Warsaw, N. Y., and organized a political Anti-Slavery party with a platform consisting of a single plank as follows:

> "Resolved, That in our judgment every consideration of duty and expediency which ought to control the action of Christian freemen requires of the Abolitionists of the United States to organize a distinct and independent political party, embracing all the necessary means for nominating candidates for office and sustaining them by public suffrage."

---

[1] The editor is indebted to Rev. D. W. C. Huntington, D. D., of Bradford, Pa.

This was about 64 years after the organization of the first Abolition society; and 64 years after the Moreau "Temperance Society" was formed the Prohibition political party held its first National Nominating Convention (at Columbus, O., Feb. 22, 1872).

Nothing is more remarkable in the history of these two political movements than the striking similarity between the arguments against separate party action brought to bear upon the adherents of the "Third Party" of a generation ago, and those used to show the inexpediency and immorality of radical Prohibitionists to-day. As "Prohibition doesn't prohibit" is a favorite claim of the anti-Prohibitionists, so the prediction that emancipation would not emancipate was industriously urged by the anti-Abolitionists. "It is a singular fact," said the *People's Friend* of Skowhegan, Me. (a pro-slavery paper), "that while it is well known that the emancipation of African slaves in the West Indies, especially in the island of Jamaica, has not only rendered the island a desert, but the Africans themselves the most miserable savages and idolators, yet clergymen, men professing the Christian religion, should from their pulpits recommend a similar course in this country. It is not emancipation itself that is complained of, but the injudicious manner in which it was done—emancipation without regard to consequences or the future welfare of the slaves. It is said that the Jamaica negroes are the most miserable beings on the face of the earth, and are fast returning to the worship of idols, beasts, trees and serpents."[1]

The following appeal in the Portland *Inquirer*, just before the Presidential election of 1852 (Oct. 28), corresponds in letter and spirit with the closing words addressed at the end of each political campaign to the rank and file of the Prohibitionists by their leaders:

> "Vote for principle: vote right, and you need not fear the consequences. A vote given in accordance with the dictates of conscience is not lost; its salutary influence, a noble testimony for truth and freedom, will be felt, whether the candidate for whom it is given is elected or not. Those votes only are lost which are given for unfit men, in violation of principle."

The Abolitionists, like the Prohibitionists, were bitterly taunted with the comparative insignificance of their party strength and besought to abandon a political organization that seemed to be without prospect of success. Replying to this method of reasoning, the Portland *Inquirer* said, Sept. 8, 1853:

> "Many people have been unable to see how voting for the Free Democracy [Abolition party] could effect anything in favor of free principles. They have figured it and cannot make out that we shall ever secure decisive majorities, and without that, votes are all thrown away. . . . The fact is, we shall have majorities fast enough by and by, but at present we hardly need them. A powerful, firm minority for just principles is in the end precisely equivalent to a majority. . . . In Ohio there is a good illustration of the power of our votes, though a decided minority of a little over 30,000. While the slave Democracy all over the country elsewhere are prostrating themselves upon the Baltimore platform [of 1852], and before the inaugural, like the worshippers of Baal around his altar, the party in that State dare do no such thing. How plain from these facts the value of a free vote, although it may not elect. . . . Such results are within our reach while a small minority, and when these are gained the step will be short to majorities. Roll up, then, the votes of free men. We can succeed."

The speeches of noted Abolition advocates are replete with arguments that, with slight adaptation, might be repeated by those desiring to most effectively answer the popular objections to the Prohibition party. Charles Sumner, in an address delivered in the Metropolitan Theatre of New York, May 9, 1855, said:

> "In such a cause I am willing to be called 'fanatic,' or what you will; I care not for aspersions, nor shall I shrink before hard words, either here or elsewhere. Hard words have been followed by personal disparagement, and the sneer is often launched that our enterprise lacks the authority of names eminent in church and State. If this be so the more is the pity on their account; for our cause is needed to them more than they are needed to our cause. But alas! It is only according to the example of history that it should be so. It is not the eminent in church and State, the rich and powerful, the favorites of fortune and of place, who most promptly welcome Truth when she heralds change in the existing order of things. It is others in poorer condition who throw open their hospitable hearts to the unattended stranger. Nay, more; it is not the dwellers amid the glare of the world, but the humble and lowly, who most clearly discern new duties, as the watchers placed in the depths of a well may observe the stars which are obscured to those who live in the effulgence of noon. Placed below the egotism and prejudice of self-interest or of a class—below the cares and temptations of wealth or power,—in the obscurity of common life, they discern the new signal and surrender themselves unreservedly to its guidance. The Saviour

---

[1] Quoted in Austin Willey's *Enquirer* (published at Portland, Me.), Aug. 23, 1853.

> knew this. He did not call the Priest or Levite or Pharisee to follow him, but upon the humble fishermen of the Sea of Galilee."

And in another speech (Sept. 16, 1852) Mr. Sumner made the following reply to the frequent declaration that a "third party" effort was inexpedient and hopeless:

> "But there is one apology which is in common to the supporters of both the old parties and which is often in their mouths when pressed for their inconsistent persistence in adhering to these parties It is dogmatically asserted that there can be but two parties, that a third party is impossible, particularly in our country, and that, therefore, all persons, however opposed to slavery must be content in one of the old parties. This assumption, which is without any foundation in reason, has been so often put forth that it has acquired a certain currency; and many who reason hastily or who implicitly follow others, have adopted it as their all-sufficient excuse for their conduct. Confessing their own opposition to slavery, they yet yield to the domination of party and become dumb. All this is wrong morally, and, therefore, must be wrong politically."

Joshua R. Giddings, explaining the rationale of the separate party movement for Abolition, used these striking words in a speech in the National House of Representatives, June 23, 1852:

> "I am aware that a strong effort is making to induce our Free Democracy [Abolitionists] to sustain the Whig candidate [Gen. Winfield Scott] at the coming election. With the gentleman nominated I have long been acquainted. To him nor to the Democratic nominee have I any personal objection. But if elected he is pledged to maintain the outrages, the revolting crimes pertaining to the compromise measures and Fugitive Slave law, to render them perpetual so far as he may be able, to prevent all discussion relating to them. To vote for him is to vote for his policy, to identify ourselves in favor of the avowed doctrines which he is pledged to support, to give proof by our votes that we approve the platform on which he stands. But, sir, why vote for Scott in preference to Pierce? Of the men I say nothing. They merely represent the doctrines of the parties that nominated them. . . . The doctrines of the Whig party pledge them and their candidate to maintain slavery. . . . This is as far, I think, as human depravity can go. If the Democratic party has dived deeper into moral political putridity, some archangel fallen must have penned their confession of faith. If there be such a distinction, it can only be discovered by a refinement of casuistry too intricate for honest men to exert. Sir, suppose there was a shade of distinction in the depths of depravity to which those parties have descended, does it become men—free men—men of moral principle, of political integrity—to be straining their visions and using intellectual microscopes to discover that shade of moral darkness? No, sir; let every man who feels he has a country to save, a character to sustain—that he owes a duty to mankind and to God—come forward at once, and wage a bold and exterminating war against these doctrines, so abhorrent to freedom and humanity."

The bitter opposition of many good men to the radical Prohibition movement was paralleled in the Anti-Slavery crusade. Biblical arguments were used by the antagonists of Abolition. Although most of the active Abolitionists were devout Christians, and the cause derived earnest and able support from the churches, vigorous resistance was offered by influential clergymen. Rev. Nehemiah Adams of Boston, Rev. Dr. Lord (President of Dartmouth College), and Bishop Hopkins of Vermont wrote books to counteract the teachings of the Abolitionists. So distinguished and noble-spirited a Methodist leader as Wilbur Fisk discouraged their efforts.[1] It is said that only three of the 23 ministers in Springfield, Ill. (Lincoln's home), voted for Abraham Lincoln in 1860.

The Whig party treated the slavery question in essentially the same way that its successor, the Republican party, has treated the Prohibition issue. In localities where the Abolition sentiment was strong the Whigs professed Anti-Slavery sympathy and tendencies, and made much of the pro-slavery attitude of the Democrats. Elsewhere they took all necessary pains to assure the slave power that the party would protect its interests. E. V. Smalley's valuable "History of the Republican Party" (New York, 1884), discusses in a very candid way the unsatisfactory and cowardly behavior of the Whigs. "The Whigs dodged the slavery question altogether," says Mr. Smalley (p. 17); and "as a national organization it [the Whig party] was obliged to cater to the South, . . . and no positive declaration against the extension of slavery could be got from its conventions" (p. 15). The Abolitionists were frequently charged with responsibility for defeating the Whig party, just as the Prohibitionists are blamed for beating the Republicans. In 1844 it was the Abolition vote in the State of New York that caused the defeat of Henry Clay for the Presidency; and just 40 years later the defeat of Blaine was attributed to the large Prohibition vote in the same State.

---

[1] See "Life of Wilbur Fisk," by George Prentice, D.D., (Boston, 1890), pp. 194-221.

All sorts of compromises were resorted to during the Anti-Slavery agitation. Slavery was permitted in some States and forbidden in others. Even the tax plea was advocated: several times it was proposed in Congress to put a tax upon imported slaves, and thus secure a Government revenue from a traffic that "could not be suppressed." Indeed, there were plausible reasons for the claim that the slave trade could not be stopped; for according to the admission of Southern men the smuggling of African negroes into Southern ports was regularly carried on for years after the traffic was prohibited, and although it was declared by act of Congress that all Africans landed in the United States should be forfeited to the Government and entitled to freedom, not one African of all the 100,000 or more so landed was ever forfeited.

A still more curious coincidence is found in the fact that statesmen of the highest character and talent strenuously insisted that legalization of the slave system had made it thoroughly legitimate and established a right of property in slaves not to be gainsayed or rudely disturbed. Thus Henry Clay said in a speech that "Two hundred years of legislation have sanctioned and sanctified negro slaves as property."[1]

The Abolitionists, like the Prohibitionists, were unmercifully abused and ridiculed. Daniel Webster called their movement "a rub-a-dub agitation"[2] Henry Clay sneeringly said they were "under the influence of negrophobia."[3] Chancellor Walworth called them "visionary enthusiasts" and "reckless demagogues."[4] Mr. Preston of South Carolina, in a speech in Congress on a motion made by James Buchanan, said that they were "hot-headed and cold-hearted, ignorant and blood-thirsty fanatics." Their petitions were denounced as "the rant and rhapsody of meddling fanatics, interlarded with texts of Scripture." A leading Whig journal of Albany, N. Y., said of the Free-Soilers: "They now constitute a sectional, political, Abolition party, with that poor despised member of the United States Senate, William H. Seward, for their leader. They can never succeed in this State, and if they could they must be a miserable minority and powerless in the nation."

Nearly all the most earnest Anti-Slavery leaders were devoted to temperance principles, frequently advocating advanced legislation. Gerrit Smith, Charles Sumner, Henry Wilson, Abraham Lincoln, Wendell Phillips, Horace Greeley and many others were thoroughly in sympathy with the anti-liquor cause.

The vote of the Anti-Slavery men in national contests was at first discouragingly small, and even after four Presidential compaigns had been fought their strength was unimportant when compared with that of either of the other parties. Below are given the votes cast for the Presidential candidates of the Anti-Slavery men and also of the Prohibitionists:

ANTI-SLAVERY VOTE.

1840, James G. Birney (Liberty party),	7,059
1844, James G. Birney (Liberty party),	62,300
1848, Martin Van Buren (Free-Soil party)	291,263
1852, John P. Hale (Free-Soil party),	156,140
1856, John C. Fremont (Republican party)	1,341,264
1860, Abraham Lincoln (Republican party)	1,866,352

PROHIBITION VOTE.

1872, James Black	5,607
1876, Green Clay Smith	9,737
1880, Neal Dow	9,678
1884, John P. St. John	150,626
1888, Clinton B. Fisk	249,945

The heavy decrease in the Anti-Slavery vote in 1852 was due to the desertion of many Democrats who had voted for ex-President Van Buren in 1848 from personal reasons rather than because of deep-seated convictions against slavery. With the Presidential contest of 1852 the Whig party made its last national campaign of importance; its disintegration followed, and in the struggles of 1856 and 1860 its successor, the Republican party, took an attitude satisfactory to most of the foes of slavery. These explanations are important in comparing the Abolition and Prohibition votes.

Appleton, James.—Born in Ipswich, Mass., in 1786, and died at the same place in 1862. He was prominent as an Abolitionist, and early in life became interested in the temperance reform. In

---

[1] Quoted in "Complete Works of W. E. Channing, D.D." (London, George Routledge & Sons), p. 660.

[2] Speeches and Lectures of Wendell Phillips (Lee & Shepard, 1884), pp. 38, 39, 50.

[3] Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America, by Henry Wilson, vol. 1, p. 139.

[4] Ibid, vol. 1, p. 235.

1831 he listened to a debate on the license question in the Massachusetts Legislature, and from that time forward was firm in the conviction that the liquor traffic, if injurious, should be prohibited and not licensed or countenanced in any way. He thus early became a champion of absolute Prohibition, and in 1832 clearly stated his views in a series of letters in the Salem *Gazette.* "The license system has been tried," he wrote, "and we have a right to pronounce it a total failure. The best test of the utility of any law is experience. There is no ground for believing that a greater quantity of ardent spirits would have been consumed had there been no regulations of its sale whatever. A law should be passed prohibiting the sale of ardent spirits. Why should it not be prohibited? It has been proved again and again, by competent witnesses, that so far from being valuable to any one purpose, it is the direst calamity that ever visited our world." In 1833 Gen. Appleton removed to Portland, Me., where he resided for 20 years. In 1836 he was elected to theMaine Legislature. In presenting his report as Chairman of a certain committee he took occasion to make an able plea for entire Prohibition. "If we have any law on the subject," said he, "it should be absolutely Prohibitory." This report was laid on the table, but its unanswerable logic opened the way for the expression of public sentiment resulting in the enactment of the famous Maine law of 1846, and the passage of the improved measure (with search and seizure clauses) of 1851. Perhaps to Gen. James Appleton, rather than to any other man, belongs the title of "Father of Prohibition."

Ardent Spirits.—A term applied to distilled liquors containing a large proportion of alcohol, as distinguished from malt and vinous liquors containing a small proportion.

Arizona.—See Index.

Arkansas.—See Index.

Arthur, Timothy Shay.—Born near Newburgh, N. Y., in 1809, and died in Philadelphia, March 6, 1885. In 1817 he removed with his parents to Baltimore, Md. His school advantages were few, and he was considered stupid and unpromising as a pupil. His progress was so slow that his father concluded that the attempt to educate him was a waste of time, and he was apprenticed to learn a trade. During his years of apprenticeship he adopted a system of self-education through reading. When 18 years of age he became a member of the first temperance society organized in Maryland, and ever after he was an earnest champion of the movement. Defective eye-sight forced him to abandon his trade after he had followed it seven years, and during the next three years he was in a counting-room. His new position gave him more time for reading and writing, and he began to contribute to the press, but without compensation and with no idea of making literature his profession. Obtaining the editorial charge of a newspaper in 1833, he soon achieved some local reputation. In 1836 he was married to Eliza Alden of Portland, Me., who became a devoted wife and bore him seven children. In 1841 he removed to Philadelphia, and began to produce sketches, magazine articles and books at a rapid rate. He established a periodical, which, having undergone many changes, is still published as *Arthur's Illustrated Home Magazine.* He also projected the *Children's Hour* and the *Workingman.* Though the earliest of Mr. Arthur's writings were more or less sensational, most of his distinctive work belongs to the order of mild, moral fiction. His reminiscences of the Washingtonian movement inspired his book, "Six Nights with the Washingtonians," which had a large sale. His best-known temperance tale is "Ten Nights in a Barroom." It became immediately popular, and very large editions were sold. In 1872 he published "Three Years in a Man-Trap," another temperance story which shared the popularity of its predecessors.

Atlanta.—See Local Option.

Austin, Henry W.—Born in Skaneateles, New York, Aug. 1, 1828, and died in Oak Park, Ill., Dec. 24, 1889. He left home at the age of 21 and engaged in business, first in New Haven, Conn., then in Kingston, Can., and Syracuse, N. Y., and finally in Chicago, where he opened a hardware store. By patient industry and judicious investments when Chicago was young, he acquired considerable property. He was the founder of a thriving suburb of Chicago bearing his name. One of its residents says of this town that "among its 5,000 people no saloon has ever intruded, nor any disorderly house, nor have so many as a score of arrests ever been made there from crimes resulting from intoxicating drinks or broils, except of persons from the neighboring city." For 25 years he resided in Oak Park, another Chicago suburb. Cursed at first with saloons and a foreign population that it was impossible to out-vote, Oak Park is now one of the model temperance towns of Illinois. Mr. Austin was mainly responsible for the reform. The last saloon in the place was banished through his action in leasing for $5,000, for a term of ten years, the premises occupied by it. He was elected to the State Legislature to advocate the idea, originating with him, of setting aside land in Chicago for a system of parks to surround the city. The miles of beautiful park-lands on the west side of the city are the result of his labor. Always a temperance man, Mr. Austin, while a member of the Legislature, secured the passage of a bill making landlords as well as saloon-keepers responsible for the damages resulting from the sale of intoxicants. This was generally regarded at the time as a radical measure. During the Presidential campaign of 1884 he left the Republicans to ally himself with the Prohibition party. From this time until his death he was actively identified with the cause of Prohibition, and contributed liberally toward its advancement both by financial support and personal labor. For some time he was Chairman of the Illinois State Prohibition Committee, and afterwards was manager of the *Lever*.

Australasia.—Australia is divided into five parts, with areas and populations as follows: (1) Western Australia, 975,920 square miles; population, 45,000. (2) South Australia, 903,425 square miles; population, 313,000. (3) Queensland, 668,224 square miles; population, 364,000. (4) New South Wales, 309,175 square miles; population, 1,045,000. (5) Victoria, 87,884 square miles; population, 1,035,000. Two important islands are to be added: (6) Tasmania, 26,375 square miles, with a population of 141,000. (7) New Zealand, 104,235 square miles, with a population of 607,000. Australia, Tasmania and New Zealand are British colonies, and, taken together, constitute what is known as Australasia.

Of the 1,044 people with whom Capt. Phillips founded the first settlement in Australia (Sydney, 1788), seven-tenths were convicted criminals, and the remainder their guard. In celebration of the event a pint of rum was given to every man, half a pint to every woman, and a pint of porter to every soldier. For years afterward convicts were cast by the hundreds on these shores, and how the drink was honored might be seen from the fact that the very rum barrels bore the stamp of the Royal Mint. As the State, so the church was founded in liquor. It is recorded that part of the cost for building the first Church of England was paid in Jamaica rum. The evil results were soon apparent, and various Governors raised their voices against the traffic. In 1797 Governor Hunter wrote: "The introduction of this destructive trade has done immense mischief. Spirituous liquors have completed the ruin of many who might have been perfectly independent." And when the farmers asked for Government relief he said, "Shut up your drink-shops." Governor Blyth writes that in 1807 "the farmers were in debt chiefly because of their parting with their crops for drink." But these warning voices did not avail. Though several of the American and English emigrants during 1835-7 were total abstainers, it was not until 1838 that the real total abstinence movement commenced. In that year (September) Mr. William Rowe, an English pledged abstainer, succeeded in Sydney, with the support of the Governor, in forming the first Australian total abstinence society. Governor Gipps himself became President of the men's, and Lady Gipps of the woman's branch of the society. Its motto was, "Temperance is moderation in things innocent and abstinence from things hurtful." Similar societies were started at Hobart (Tas.) 1839, Adelaide (S. A.) 1840, and Melbourne (Vict.) 1842. Since then nearly all American and English total abstinence societies have been nominally reproduced in Australia. But many, especially the larger ones—and notably the Melbourne Total Abstinence Society—are mere money-making institutions.

In the beginning, however, the total abstinence societies were doing good work; but the gold discoveries (1851) brought sudden wealth and spendthrift riotous living. What enormous riches the drink traffic amassed during the decade 1852-62 is seen from the following official figures, unparaleled, I believe, in drink annals: In Victoria, in 1852, the drink-bill per head reached £21 14 5; in 1853 £27 19 7.

Meanwhile immigrants from America and England had brought news of the political temperance movements in those countries, and in February, 1857, Mr. G. J. Crouch of Sydney inaugurated the political temperance work by starting the New South Wales Alliance. It followed faithfully the footsteps of the United Kingdom Alliance, but found slight support. In 1883 it was reorganized and baptized the New South Wales Local Option League. In the other colonies political temperance movements were begun, but with small results. Of these, specially worthy of remembrance is the one formed more than thirty years ago on pure Maine Law lines by the noble veteran philanthropist, Dr. Singleton of Melbourne. It died from want of funds. Meanwhile the traffic grew richer and steadily intrenched itself in legislatures and society. In Melbourne (1880) an International Temperance Convention passed a resolution urging each colony to form an Alliance for securing Local Option. This was soon accomplished, and from then till now the political policy of the temperance forces in Australia has been to secure what is called "complete Local Option" in the matter of public-house licenses. Laws on these lines were passed in New Zealand (1881), in Queensland (1885), partial ones in New South Wales (1883) and Victoria (1885), some granting Local Option as regards new licenses, and some Local Option as regards excess over what is termed statutory number of licenses (on the lines of the Ontario, Can., Crooks act), subject to compensation. Those colonies not yet under Local Option are clamoring for it, and those that have it are dissatisfied—Victoria and New South Wales with the *character* of the Local Option, New Zealand and Queensland with its *results*. It is no wonder; for although the Queensland Local Option is the acknowledged goal to which all the rest are tending, still, according to the uncontradicted statement of the Victorian Alliance Secretary in the International Temperance Convention at Melbourne in 1888, "only three public houses had thus far been closed up by means of that act." On the same occasion Sir William Fox, ex-Premier and President of the New Zealand Alliance, said of that country: "It may be imagined the people can now do what they like. In theory they can, but not in practice. The act has been in existence for seven years and there have been a number of committees with a majority of teetotallers on the Bench, but during that period out of 1,500 public houses in the colony only 25 have been suppressed on the ground that they were not wanted." Still the cry is Local Option, and, if possible, louder than ever. Rev. Mr. Nicholson's paper to the International Temperance Convention (1888) about South Australia, says: "(1) Our first demand is for Local Option in the threefold degrees provided by the Queensland act, viz.: First, as applied against an *increase* of licenses; second, for a definite numerical *decrease;* third, for the *cessation of all licenses* where temperance sentiment is strong and permanent. (2) We seek a repeal of the clause that grants a renewal of license as a matter of course."

Thus the Australasian pseudo-Local Option movement resolves itself into a licensing reform movement such as the United States liquor traffic would probably gladly embrace; but here the traffic is strong enough to dictate better terms. For example, according to the *Good Templar*, the leading temperance paper of the colonies, in the general elections of March, 1889, in New South Wales, in a House of 137 members 101 were in favor of Local Option, 19 doubtful, 17 opposed; yet when, on the 2d of August following, after a two months' notice, it was proposed to introduce the Liquor Traffic Veto bill, the House was counted out. In Victoria it is even worse. The leader in the *Licensed Victualers' Advocate*, liquor organ of Victoria, for Feb. 6, 1889, said: "It is an open secret that in the ranks of the trade there is a good deal of sympathy with the policy of Local Option." So general was this "sympathy" that the Victorian Alliance issued a special manifesto on the eve of the elections warning electors to "beware of the wolf in sheep's clothing as personified in the publicans' candidate who advocates Local Option."

In the teeth of the most unsparing opposition it has ever been my fate to observe, I have succeeded in forming a Prohibition nucleus—the Victorian Home Protection party—on the same basis as I adopted in England and Sweden. We are determined to divide the country, if possible, on the issue of home-protection or home-destruction—our platform including, besides the destruction of the drink, the securing of Woman Suffrage, compulsory State education in citizenship and ballot reform.

AXEL GUSTAFSON.

Supplemental Facts, from J. W. Meaden, Editor of the Melbourne Alliance Record.—Among the temperance organizations first formed in the Australasian colonies was the Independent Order of Rechabites, which now has a total membership of about 25,000, one-half being in Victoria. The Order of the Sons and Daughters of Temperance is divided into two National Divisions—the "Australasian" and the "Victorian and South Australian"—with a combined membership of between 9,000 and 10,000.

The Independent Order of Good Templars has, with varying success, aided during the past years in the work of "reclaiming the fallen and keeping others from falling." It has established Grand Lodges in all the colonies, and has a membership in New South Wales of 16,668 adults, in Victoria of about 4,000, in Queensland of 3,000 and in New Zealand of 5,498.

The newest organization for the promotion of temperance principles is the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, transplanted from America by Mary Clement Leavitt, and apparently destined to take deep root in Australia. It is still in the initial stage of its history, but Unions are being rapidly formed throughout Australasia. The work of organization has been undertaken by ladies who are not only of devoted spirit but who possess special qualifications for their important duties. Gospel temperance effort is carried on by numerous workers, there are many Bands of Hope, and considerable attention is paid to the temperance movement by the most advanced of the churches.

The following table shows the annual consumption of liquors and their values in the various Australasian colonies for the year 1887:[1]

COLONY.	QUANTITIES.						VALUES.						Per Head of Mean Populat'n
	SPIRITS.		WINE.		BEER.		SPIRITS.	WINE.		BEER.		Total Cost.	
	Imported.	Excise.	Imported.	Made in Colony.	Imported.	Made in Colony.	Imported.	Imported.	Made in Colony.	Imported.	Made in Colony.		
	Gallons.	Gallons.	Gallons.	Gallons.	Gallons.	Gallons.	£	£	£	£	£	£	£. s. d.
Victoria............	959,629	152,145	128,746	845,365	1,127,160	16,056,707	2,084,575	225,305	205,877	338,148	2,408,506	5,352,411	5 5 0
New South Wales..	1,130,964		161,033	601,807	2,126,314	9,380,895	2,066,546	180,485	309,948	650,471	1,407,135	4,614,585	4 10 3
New Zealand.......	459,757	..	111,618	..	286,299	4,159,520	919,514	223,236	..	85,889	831,904	2,060,543	3 5 0
Queensland	534,952	84,895	79,610	118,468	975,007	2,339,474	1,116,212	139,317	41,463	292,528	350,921	1,940,441	5 9 4
South Australia....	140,398	34,020	13,763	343,498	259,946	2,500,000	327,033	24,085	120,224	77,983	375,000	924,325	2 19 0
Tasmania..........	88,452	..	26,684	..	59,514	1,293,291	165,847	46,697	..	17,854	193,096	423,494	3 0 7
Western Australia..	57,284	..	15,024	124,240	268,347	60,000	107,470	26,292	43,484	80,503	9,000	266,686	6 10 0
												£15,582,485	£4 8 6

Local Option is the accepted policy. The present conditions may be summarized as follows:

---

[1] The calculations for New South Wales are by the Rev. F. B. Boyce of Sydney, and those for New Zealand by Mr. C. M. Gray of Christchurch. Mr. J. D. Merson, who is a recognized authority on the subject of Australasian temperance statistics, based his estimates of the other Colonies upon returns supplied by the respective Governments.

1. *New South Wales.*—Every three years the people vote on the following questions: (1) "Shall any new publicans' licenses be granted in respect of premises situate within the ward or municipality for the period of three years from this date?" (2) "Shall any renewals of publicans' licenses be granted in respect of premises situate within the ward or municipality for the period of three years from this date?" The publican's license fee is £30. Entire Sunday-closing is required, under a maximum penalty of £20. Persons apparently under 16 not to be furnished with liquor for their own consumption on the premises.

2. *New Zealand.*—(1) A Licensing Committee is vested with power to grant or refuse licenses. Those who wish to shut up the saloons must elect men in favor of doing so. (2) A vote is taken every three years to determine whether or not new licenses shall be issued. Publican's license fee, £25 to £40. Entire Sunday-closing required, under maximum penalty for first offense of £10. Children under 16 not allowed to drink on the premises.

3. *Queensland.*—This colony possesses the only provision for complete local Prohibition by direct vote. A poll may be taken in any division or subdivision, upon the petition of one-sixth of the ratepayers. Wine-seller's license fee, £10; victualler's license fee, £30. Entire Sunday-closing required, under maximum penalty of £5. Children under 14 not to be supplied under any circumstances.

4. *Victoria.*—Electors may reduce the number of hotels to a statutory limit—one hotel for each 250 inhabitants up to the first 1,000, and after that one for each 500. Spirit-merchant's license, £25. Entire Sunday-closing required, under maximum penalty of £10. Children under 16 not allowed to drink on the premises.

5. *South Australia.*—Limited Sunday selling allowed between the hours 1 and 3 P. M. The Sunday selling may be regulated by vote of the rate-payers. Publican's license fee, £30. Children under 15 not allowed to drink on the premises.

6. *Tasmania.*—Entire Sunday-closing required under maximum penalty of £5. Publican's license fee, £25.

All the colonies prohibit the sale of liquor to aborigines.

Austria.—The intemperance statistics of the Austrian Empire have strikingly refuted the arguments of the sophists who propose to counteract the increase of intemperance by the introduction of the "milder alcoholics"—beer and wine. Austria comprises eleven different nationalities, some of them addicted to the use of alcohol in its most concentrated forms, as *kirschwasser* (cherry brandy) in the Tyrol, and *slibovitz* (a vile spirit prepared by the distillation of plums and prunes) in Carinthia and Slavonic Illyria; but the best wine and beer districts—German Austria and Western Hungary—enjoy the questionable prestige of producing the most habitual drunkards, and in them there is the largest per capita consumption of alcohol. In these regions drunken brawls, incident to the revels of the public tavern, are a more fruitful cause of crime than the frequency of international border feuds. Temperance has made but little theoretical progress in any part of the Austrian Empire, and the manufacture of distilled liquors is not only tolerated but sedulously encouraged. Still an era of practical reform has been inaugurated by a decided change of habits among the upper classes, with the occasional exception of the Hungarian nobles, who consider it a duty of hospitality to maintain the convivial custom of their feudal ancestors. Drunkenness, once a boast of cavaliers and prelates, has come to be considered a disgraceful and unpardonable misdemeanor in the upper social circles of Vienna, Trieste and Prague; and one of our American temperance journals recently mentioned, as a noteworthy sign of the times, the fact that several of the officers' messes of the Austrian army have dropped wine from their regular bill of fare, and even from the list of provisions to be kept on hand for use during active service in the field.

FELIX L. OSWALD.

Supplemental Facts.—Fiscal reasons decide alcoholic legislation in Austria, and the financial condition of the country has driven the Government to impose as high a tax as possible without endangering the supposed interests of industry, commerce and agriculture. Hence many legislative acts and many changes in the legislation. In 1835 the ancient duty on consumption was changed to a tax on the vessels for fermentation, according to their size. This law continued in force till 1862, when it was replaced with a law taxing liquors according to their strength. This again was abolished in 1866, and the previous one was re-enacted. The license fee in Austria is graduated according to the population. In localities of 500 people the fee is 5 florins; in those of 500 to 2,000 people, 10 florins; 2,000 to 10,000 people, 20 florins; 10,000 to 20,000 people, 30 florins; 20,000 to 100,000 people, 45 florins; and above 100,000 people, 50 florins. (A florin is about 50 cents in American money.) Persons committing crime under the influence of liquor are punished with comparative leniency.

Mulhall (1886) estimated the average annual wine-yield of the Austrian Empire at 310,000,000 gallons, valued at $72,000,000, 1,580,000 acres being devoted to the cultivation of the grape. This agrees approximately with the estimate of the United States Consul at Marseilles, who in a report dated Feb. 27, 1889, placed the Austrian vintage for 1888 at 92,459,500 gallons, and the Hungarian vintage for the same year at 184,919,000 gallons. Austria-Hungary ranks after France, Italy and Spain among the wine-producing countries of the earth. She is also one of the chief producers of beer; Mulhall estimates that the average annual beer product is 245,000,000 gallons. The quantities of beer, wine and spirits consumed, respectively, in the Empire are stated by the same authority to be 300,000,000, 245,000,000 and 30,000,000 gallons per year.

Bacchus.—The Latin name for Dionysus, in Greek mythology the god of wine and the vineyard. The legends relate that he was the son of Zeus (Jupiter) and Semele, daughter of Cadmus, King of Thebes. When he attained to manhood Bacchus learned the secret of producing wine from the grape, and immediately set out on a long journey through Greece, Asia Minor, Arabia, Persia and India to teach this wonderful art. In Phrygia he met Rhea, who instructed him concerning her religious rites, and he resolved to become a teacher of these also. Euripides represents him as conquering Asia by means of a good deal of noise and ceremony but no bloodshed, marching at the head of an army of women and men, who, "inspired with divine fury," mingled their cries with the clashing of cymbals and the din of other musical instruments. Wherever he went this god of confusion taught the people the culture of the vine and the art of wine-making, and also instructed them in honey-making and the cultivation of the soil. Everywhere also he introduced the dances and religious rites he had learned from Rhea. The Greeks held Thebes to be the birth-place of Bacchus, but it seems probable that the worship of this deity originated in India, and was brought into Greece by migrating people. Bagis, one of the names of the Hindu god Schiva, gives a clew to the origin of the name of the wine-god. Among an agricultural people like the Greeks a pastoral deity would very naturally hold a high place in popular worship, and thus Bacchus was honored by four annual feasts, called Dionysia or Bacchanalia. These were the "country Dionysia," in rural towns and villages, the "festival of the wine-press," at Athens, the "anthestria," minor feasts, and the "Great Dionysia," celebrated at Athens. Originally only women took part in the feasts, giving themselves over to wild dances, and in their frenzy often rending animals and cutting themselves with sharp instruments. Later the festivals were popularized and characterized by song and dance and processions, headed by an image of the god. Finally license was given to every sort of immorality at these orgies, and they were occasions for general debauchery. The institution of the Greek theatre grew out of the worship of Bacchus. The Greek colonists in Southern Italy introduced the worship of the wine-god among the Romans, and in the year 495 B. C. a temple was erected to him. At first the feasts were observed with decency and decorum, the women not being permitted so much as to taste wine, and the men held under the same restraint until they had attained the age of 30; but very soon all restraint was swept away and men and women alike plunged into every excess and the grossest immoralities. Wives followed their husbands in drunken orgies, and the corruption spread among the young men and women. Things finally reached such a pass that the Roman Senate, in the year 186 B. C., was compelled to prohibit the rites and forms of Bacchanalian worship and revels.

Baird, Robert.—Born in Fayette County, Pa., Oct. 6, 1798, and died in Yonkers, N. Y., Nov. 15, 1863. He graduated from Jefferson College, Pa., and from Princeton Theological Seminary. In 1822 he became principal of an academy at Princeton. In 1828 he was appointed agent of the New Jersey Missionary Society, and he did much toward founding the present system of public schools in that State. In 1829, as agent of the American Sunday-School Union, he succeeded in increasing the annual income of that organization from $5,000 to $28,000. In 1836 he published his "History of the Temperance Societies of the United States," and having gone abroad, he arranged for the translation of the work into French. He remained in Europe nearly eight years, but in that time made two brief visits to America. His efforts abroad were divided between an attempt in the countries of southern Europe to revive the Protestant faith, and an effort in the northern countries to promote temperance reform. The French edition of his history was widely read both in France and by the French Swiss, the latter being induced by its teachings to institute temperance societies at Geneva and Fribourg. In Holland about 1,100 copies of the book were circulated. The Empress of Russia received a copy, and manifested an interest in the temperance movement. King Charles XIV of Sweden accorded a gracious reception to Mr. Baird, and at his own expense had the book translated and a copy sent to each parish in his kingdom. Quotations from the work were made by the newspapers, and Crown Prince Oscar consented to become Patron to the Swedish Temperance Society, formed at Stockholm, May 5, 1837. This society issued a second edition of Mr. Baird's history in 1839, by which time the number of temperance societies in the country had increased to 150, with 30,000 members. In 1833 King Frederick William III of Prussia sought information about the temperance societies of America, through his ambassador at Washington. Mr. Baird was therefore cordially welcomed by him when he visited Germany in 1836, and the king ordered a German translation of the work, and presented copies of it to the Emperor of Austria and the other German princes. The first German edition of 6,000 copies was exhausted, and a second was issued within a year, while by the king's orders the temperance movement was encouraged and strengthened by the authorities of both church and state. On his second visit to Europe in 1840 Mr. Baird visited Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Russia. Having arranged in Denmark for a translation of his book into Danish, and the publication of an edition of 2,000 copies, he organized a temperance committee in Christiana, Norway, which distributed 800 copies of the Danish edition among Norwegians of influence. In October, 1840, he had an interview with Emperor Nicholas at St. Petersburg, who received him favorably, and issued an edition of 10,000 copies of the book in the Russian language, and an edition of 5,000 copies in Finnish. Mr. Baird's personal interviews with men of rank and prominence were hardly less potential than the influence of his book. His other published works are "Religion in America," first issued in Scotland, and translated into several languages; "A Visit to Northern Europe;" "Protestantism in Italy," and "History of the Albigenses, Waldenses and Vaudois."

Bands of Hope.—Temperance organizations for juveniles, established in great numbers throughout all the English-speaking countries, frequently as departments of church and Sunday-school work. In the United States the name "Band of Hope" has been generally changed to "Loyal Temperance Legion," although some local organizations are continued under the old name. The Band of Hope pledge in this country is as follows:

> "I hereby solemnly pledge myself to abstain from the use of all intoxicating drinks, including wine, beer and cider, as a beverage; from the use of tobacco in every form, and from all profanity."

Concerning the Bands of Hope of the United Kingdom, Mr. Frederick Smith (Editorial Secretary) provides the following information for this work:

The first society called a Band of Hope was formed in England in October, 1847. Temperance societies for children and young people, on a distinctly total abstinence basis, had existed, however, many years earlier, both in the British Isles and the United States. The origin of the first Band of Hope must be jointly attributed to the efforts of Mrs. Carlile of Dublin, and the Rev. Jabez Tunnicliff, a Baptist minister of Leeds. In August, 1847, Mrs. Carlile visited Leeds, to address children in Sunday and day schools on the subject of temperance. Mr. Tunnicliff, who had occasionally accompanied Mrs. Carlile in her visits to the schools, felt convinced that unless something was done to follow up her labor it would be largely lost. Accordingly, before Mrs. Carlile left Leeds, a meeting was called, an organization was formed, a name was adopted and a committee was appointed to perfect the plan. The first Band of Hope meeting was held late in October, when about 300 children sat down to tea, more than 200 of them taking the following pledge:

"I promise to abstain from all intoxicating drinks as beverages."

The movement spread nowhere with greater success than in the county of its birth, where at the present time (1889) there are probably 2,000 juvenile temperance societies of one kind or other. In 1851 the first Band of Hope Union was formed. A Union for London was established in 1855, which in 1864 became the "United Kingdom Band of Hope Union." County Unions rapidly followed, and now cover the greater part of England. The United Kingdom Band of Hope Union, with which the various organizations are associated, aims at furthering the interests of the whole movement throughout the country. It assists local Unions and societies by means of its lecturers and deputations, by public meetings, conferences, missionary efforts, literature, correspondence and advice. Its sphere of work is in Bands of Hope, Sunday-schools, day schools, colleges, orphan asylums, industrial and district schools, training ships, reformatories and the homes of the children. Its latest and most important effort is the "School Scheme," by which, through the kindness of munificent friends, the committee is enabled to devote £2,000 per annum for the next five years to the delivery of scientific lectures and addresses in day schools and to other important educational work. The President of the Union is George Williams, Esq., of London, and its Secretaries are Mr. Charles Wakely and Mr. Frederick Smith.

The latest estimate of the strength of the movement, compiled from the best available data, shows that there are nearly 15,000 Bands of Hope and juvenile temperance organizations in England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland, with upwards of 1,800,000 members.

Baptist Church.—The Baptist Church is not represented as a national denomination by any conference or assembly of a thoroughly comprehensive nature. But different representative organizations within the church are fully qualified to declare its position upon a question so intimately related to religious interests as is that of temperance.

The American Baptist Home Mission Society, in session at Chicago, May 27, 1890, adopted the following resolutions, reported by Rev. H. A. Delano, D.D., of Evanston, Ill., on behalf of the Special Committee on Temperance:

"*Whereas*, We recognize in the liquor traffic an enemy of satanic and appalling force, menacing the purity of the Christian Church, the virtue of society and the safety of government; and

"*Whereas*, We believe it true policy, principle and duty to antagonize with uncompromising zeal its presence and ravages; therefore

"RESOLVED, That we declare ourselves among its most pronounced and relentless foes, believing that it has no defensible right to exist, and that it can never be reformed, and that it stands condemned by its unrighteous fruits as a thing unchristian, un-American and perilous utterly to every interest of life.

"RESOLVED, That we profoundly deplore the results of the recent Supreme Court decision [relating to the inter-State liquor traffic], whereby Prohibitory laws in Maine, Kansas, Iowa, South Dakota and other States are rendered less efficient and extremely imperiled, and we sincerely hope the Congress of the United States may speedily rise to so meet the exigency of the case, that the last estate of the liquor traffic may be worse than the first.

"RESOLVED, That we stand pledged by every legitimate means to work and pray and (as God shall give us wisdom and light) to vote for the absolute abolition and overthrow of the iniquitous traffic in State and nation."

The Baptists of the Southern States hold annual conventions. In May, 1889, they met at Memphis, Tenn., white representatives being present from Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, Arkansas, Kentucky and the Indian Territory. The following resolution, offered by J. B. Cranfill, was adopted:

"*Whereas*, The liquor traffic is a most powerful hindrance to the gospel of Christ, and an aggressive enemy to social order; and

"*Whereas*, This traffic is steadily encroaching upon all that Christian men revere and the human heart holds dear; and

"*Whereas*, It seeks to destroy the Christian Sabbath and annihilate public morals and the public conscience; and

"*Whereas*. All Christian bodies should speak out in no uncertain tones on this question; therefore, be it

"RESOLVED, by the Southern Baptists in Convention assembled, That we favor the speedy and entire Prohibition of the liquor traffic; that we oppose license for this traffic in any and all its forms, through which men buy the right to destroy human hope and happiness and blight human souls, as an offence against public morals and a sin against God."

Barbour, John Nathaniel.—Born in Boston, Mass., Oct. 4, 1805, and died in Cambridge, Mass., Jan. 29, 1890. He graduated from Eliot School, Boston, taking the highest honor, the Franklin medal. Entering a large mercantile establishment at a small salary, he performed his duties with such fidelity as soon to win the firm's confidence and a place for himself as a partner. With his uncle he established a business house which acquired many vessels and built up an extensive carrying trade. From youth Mr. Barbour was a total abstainer from both tobacco and intoxicating drink despite the jeers of his young associates. He carried his convictions and temperance principles into his business, and it was the rule of his house neither to buy nor sell alcoholic liquors, nor allow them on its vessels either for use there or as freight. This stand brought the firm into conflict with all the wholesale grocers dealing in liquors; and although he was ridiculed and sometimes boycotted, Mr. Barbour could boast that he never compromised his temperance principles for financial advantage. He enjoyed the acquaintance and friendship of many of the distinguished men and reformers of two generations. He was as staunch an advocate of the Abolition of slavery as of the temperance cause, and William Lloyd Garrison and John G. Whittier were his personal friends. He freely employed his means to further the causes he espoused, and thus did not permit himself to become very wealthy.

Barley.—The grain from which nearly all of the malt used in brewing is derived. It is the hardiest of cereals, growing at higher latitudes than any other and also capable of cultivation in warm climates. Its superiority for brewing purposes has always been recognized. It is also largely used in the production of distilled spirits, especially Scotch and Irish whiskies. Mulhall (London, 1886) estimates the number of acres devoted to barley culture and the quantities produced in leading countries as follows:

	Acres.	*Crop (bush.).*
United Kingdom.....	2.590.000	90,000,000
France...............	3,500 000	80.000.000
Germany............	3 900,000	90,000.000
Russia...............	15,500,000	130 000,000
Austria..............	5.100.000	81,000,000
Italy and Spain......	4,700.000	95,000,000
Belgium and Holland.	230.000	8.000,000
Scandinavia..........	1,300 000	39,000.000
Roumania, etc........	2.000,000	40,000.000
Europe............	38,820,000	653,000,000
United States[1]........	1,700 000	40 000,000
Japan	2,000,000	50.000.000
Egypt	1,000.000	15,000 000
Algeria	2,000 000	45.000.000
British Colonies......	940.000	34,000,000
Totals.............	46,460,000	837,000,000

Barnes, Albert.—Born in Rome, N. Y., Dec. 1, 1798; died Dec. 24, 1870. He graduated at Hamilton College, in 1820, and from the Princeton Theological Seminary in 1824. In 1825 he was installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Morristown, N. J., and in 1830 he took charge of the 1st Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, where he officiated for more than thirty years. Although eminent both as a preacher and scholar he refused all proffered degrees and titles. He achieved a great reputation as a commentator, and his "Notes on the New Testament" enjoyed an extensive circulation and became a standard work on both sides of the water. In 1857 he published a work on "The Church and Slavery," in which he took radical ground for freedom. He was equally pronounced on the liquor question: his sermon on the "Throne of Iniquity" and his tract on "The Traffic in Ardent Spirits" are masterly arguments and were widely read. He took the ground that this evil could be suppressed only by law and by Prohibitive enactments; and he believed that upon the churches and ministers of the gospel rested the great responsibility of leading the attack against the traffic. "The pulpit," said he, "should speak in tones deep and solemn and constant, reverberating through the land. The watchmen should see eye to eye. Of every officer and member of a church it should be known where he may be found. We want no vacillating counsels, no time-serving apologies, no coldness, no reluctance, no shrinking back in this cause. Every church of Christ the world over should be, in very deed, an organization of pure temperance under the headship and patronage of Jesus Christ, the friend and model of purity. The pulpit must speak out. And the press must speak. And you, fellow-Christians, are summoned by the God of purity to take your stand and cause your influence to be felt." Concerning the necessity for a more vigorous method than moral suasion, he said:

---

[1] The Census for 1880 states that in that year there were 1,997,727 acres devoted to barley-culture, producing 43,997,495 bushels.

> "There is a class of men, and those most deeply interested in the matter, that you can never influence by moral suasion. They are men who enter no sanctuary, who place themselves aloof from argument, whose hearts are hard, whose consciences are seared, whose sole motive is gain, and who, if the moral part of the community abandon a business, will only drive it on themselves the faster. What are you to do with such men? You may go far in the temperance reformation by moral suasion, but it has failed in removing the evil, and, from the nature of the case, must always fail, while the State throws its protecting shield over the traffic."

For 45 years he was an aggressive and a radical enemy of the saloon and champion of temperance principles. In the beginning the cause was very unpopular and he suffered persecution, but he lived long enough to see it respected and triumphing.

Barrooms.—See SALOON.

Barrows, Lorenzo Dow.—Born in Windham, Vt., July 1, 1817; died in Plymouth, N. H., Feb. 18, 1878. He received a thorough academic training, and throughout life remained a student. He entered the ministry in 1836 and served Methodist Episcopal churches in Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Ohio. He was for four years a Presiding Elder. From 1856 to 1859 he was President of the Pittsburg (Pa.) Female College, and from 1866 to 1871, and again in 1877, held the same position in the New Hampshire Conference Seminary and Female College. Although feeble in body he was a clear, forcible speaker, effective in debate and aggressive for reform, and especially for the temperance reform, in which he became interested early in life. He was one of the organizers of the Prohibition party in New Hampshire, and was nominated as its first candidate for Governor in 1870, receiving 1,167 votes. March 4, 1870, he issued the first number of the *Prohibition Herald*, a weekly newspaper which he edited and controlled until September, 1871. He was not only a gifted speaker but a forcible writer. Many temperance workers owe to Dr. Barrows's words and example their enlistment in the movement.
D. C. BABCOCK.

Beecher, Lyman.—Born in New Haven, Conn., Oct. 12, 1775; died in Brooklyn, N. Y., Jan. 10, 1863. This renowned preacher graduated from the Theological School of Yale College in 1797, and the next year was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church of East Hampton, Long Island, with a salary of $300 a year. While pastor here he married Rosana Foote, who contributed to their support by teaching school. He was installed pastor of the Congregational Church at Litchfield, Conn., in 1810, and remained there 16 years. In 1826 he became pastor of the Hanover Street Church of Boston, and in 1832 was chosen President of Lane Seminary, near Cincinnati, O. He held this position for twenty years, and during one-half that time added to his other duties the pastorate of the 2d Presbyterian Church of Cincinnati. Resigning the Presidency of the Seminary in 1852 he ceased his active labors, though doing occasional preaching. Three times married, Dr. Beecher was the father of 13 children, six of whom became clergymen. Two of the family, Henry Ward Beecher and Harriet Beecher Stowe, attained world-wide reputation.

Perhaps no man in America has done more to mould public opinion on the temperance question than Lyman Beecher. He was first aroused to a realization of the magnitude of the drink evil in 1808, while pastor at East Hampton, by observing how a conscienceless grogseller corrupted the Montauk Indians. "There was a grogseller in our neighborhood," he writes, "who drank himself and corrupted others. He always kept his jug under the bed, to drink in the night, till he was choked off by death. He would go down with his barrel of whiskey in a wagon to the Indians and get them tipsy and bring them in debt; he would get all their corn, and bring it back in his wagon—in fact, he stripped them. Then, in winter, they must come up twenty miles, buy their own corn, and pack it home on their shoulders or starve. Oh! it was horrible, horrible. It burned and burned in my mind, and I swore a deep oath in my mind that it shouldn't be so." A little later he was greatly moved upon reading Dr. Benjamin Rush's famous essay on "The Effects of Ardent Spirits on the Human Body and Mind." In 1812, soon after his removal to Litchfield, he listened to the report of the committee appointed by the Connecticut General Association of Congregational Churches to consider the temperance problem and answer the question, "How can drunkenness be prevented?" The conclusions of the committee were feeble and evasive; the growing evils of intemperance were deplored, but the committee seemed to be of the opinion that nothing could be done. Beecher's soul was stirred. He immediately arose and moved to discharge the committee and appoint a new one. The motion prevailed and he was made Chairman of the new committee. On the next day he brought in a report which he says, in his autobiography, was "the most important paper that I ever wrote." It recommended that all ministers preach on the subject of intemperance; that intoxicating liquors be banished from ministerial and church meetings; that church members abstain from drinking or trafficking in liquors; that parents exclude liquor from their families and admonish their children against it; that farmers, manufacturers, etc., provide other drinks than alcoholic beverages for their laborers; that temperance literature be prepared and circulated, and that associations be organized for the promotion of temperance and good morals. After much discussion these recommendations, extremely radical as they were for those days, were approved, and it was ordered that a thousand copies be printed for circulation.

Dr. Beecher's celebrated "Six Sermons on Intemperance," delivered in 1826 and published in book form in 1827, mark a most important epoch in the temperance movement. Reprinted abroad and eagerly read by many thousands, they did more than any other agency to create a distinct and practical temperance sentiment, and were recognized as the standard authority on the temperance question for many years. In them he indicated the necessity for the absolute Prohibition of the liquor traffic. "There is no remedy for intemperance but the cessation of it," he declared. "The time is not distant, we trust," said he, "when the use of ardent spirits will be proscribed by a vote of all the churches in our land, and when the commerce in that article shall, equally with the slave trade, be regarded as inconsistent with a creditable profession of Christianity." The following sentences show the radicalism of his views as to the ways and means necessary for accomplishing reform :

"It is in vain to rely alone upon self-government and voluntary abstinence. This, by all means, should be encouraged and enforced, and may limit the evil but can never expel it. Alike hopeless are all the efforts of the pulpit and the press, without something more radical, efficient and permanent. If knowledge only, or argument or motive were needed, the task of reformation would be easy; but argument may as well be exerted upon the wind, and motive be applied to chain down the waves. Thirst and the love of filthy lucre are incorrigible. Many may be saved by these means; but, with nothing more, many will be lost and the evil will go down to other ages.

"The remedy, whatever it may be, must be universal—operating permanently at all times and in all places. Short of this, everything which can be done will be but the application of temporary expedients. There is somewhere a mighty energy of evil at work in the production of intemperance; and until we can discover and destroy this vital power of mischief we shall labor in vain. Intemperance in our land is not accidental; it is rolling in upon us by the violation of some great laws of human nature. In our views, and in our practice as a nation, there is something fundamentally wrong; and the remedy, like the evil, must be found in the correct application of general principles. It must be a universal and national remedy. What, then, is this universal, natural and national remedy for intemperance? It is the banishment of ardent spirits from the list of lawful articles of commerce by a correct and efficient public sentiment, such as has turned slavery out of half of our land and will yet expel it from the world."

Beer.—See Malt Liquors.

Belgium.—All tradesmen in Belgium are taxed, but no special license is required to sell intoxicating drinks. Nothing is easier than to start and conduct a liquor business. The number of places selling alcoholic beverages has increased enormously in the last 30 years. An official report gives the following figures:

Year.	*Drink-shops.*
1850	50,000
1880	125 000
1884	130,000

From 1850 to 1880 the population increased 25 per cent., while the number of drink-shops increased 150 per cent. It is estimated that there is now one drink-shop for every 41 inhabitants, or for every nine men throughout the country. The unlimited opportunities for drinking, the constant tendency among nearly all classes of people to drink more and more, and the growing impurity of liquors have combined to increase appallingly the number of crimes, suicides and cases of insanity. A Belgian writer says: "The moral level of the people is being lowered continually."

I present a few startling facts from official documents:

From 1873 to 1881 the people spent on an average 474,323,000 francs, or $94,864,000 per annum for intoxicating drink. The average quantity consumed each year per inhabitant from 1875 to 1881 was as follows: Beer, 55.9 galls.; spirits (at 50%), 2.69 galls.; wine, 0.85 galls. In 1840 the number of suicides was 204, or 51 per 1,000,000 inhabitants. In 1880 the number was 553, or 97 per 1,000,000 inhabitants. In 1846 there were 720 cases of insanity per 100,000 inhabitants. In 1881 there were 1,470—increase, 104 per cent. The increase in the number of crimes since 1840 has been at the rate of 141 per cent., allowing for the increase in population. M. Dupetiaux, Inspector-General of Prisons in Belgium, says: "My experience extends now over a quarter of a century, and I declare that four-fifths of the crimes and misery that have come before me in my professional or private life have been the result of intemperance." It has been repeatedly stated on the best authority that four-fifths of the deaths in the hospitals in Brussels are due, directly or indirectly, to drink. What has been done to remedy this state of things? "La Ligue Patriotique contre l'alcoolism" was started in 1879 under the title "L'Association Belge contre l'abus des boissons alcoolique." Its work has chiefly been (1) to collect information regarding the drinking habits of the people, together with the evils resulting therefrom, and to spread abroad this information; (2) To endeavor to get laws passed to lessen intemperance. All the laws hitherto enacted have been directed against drunkenness rather than for lessening the temptations to drink.

In October, 1889, the League took a step in advance by establishing a "Café populaire" in Brussels, where all spirituous liquors are excluded and refreshments are served. There is a reading-room fitted up with a library and newspapers, and amusements are provided. A circular was distributed among the workingmen, calling on them to unite in a temperance society and take a pledge against distilled liquors while retaining the privilege to moderately use fermented liquors. About 80 members have been enrolled. This is the first pledge issued by the League.

In Antwerp a Good Templars' Lodge has existed for over 12 years, and has done useful work, especially among the seamen; but as its proceedings are carried on in English and most of its members are Englishmen it naturally cannot have the same influence that a distinctively Belgian society could have.

In 1885 an International Congress against the abuse of alcoholic liquors was held in Antwerp. One result of it was the introduction into Belgium of the Swiss temperance society, known as "La Croix Bleue." This is a total abstinence society, and it has made some progress in the South of Belgium, chiefly among the Protestant workmen. "La Société de St. Jean Baptiste" is the name of an organization started at St. Frond (in Belgium) in November, 1886, and now enjoying the patronage of the Lord Bishop of Liege. It issues the same accommodating pledge as the society at Brussels. At the close of 1888 its members numbered 700 adults and 4,000 children. This society has received the benediction of Pope Leo XIII.

CHARLOTTE A. GRAY.

Benefits of Prohibition.—See PROHIBITION, BENEFITS OF.

Bible and Drink.—There are two possible views of the relation which the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures bear to intoxicating wine, drugs and strong drink: either (1) that they are harmonious in all their statements as the beliefs of inspired men, or (2) that they are the records of various fallible opinions, more or less inaccurate. Of course the proof of the first position fails if those Scriptures contradict either the laws of morals, the principles of science or the facts of life. Any claim that contravenes reason, conscience and fact is an imposture. We must, however, always distinguish between the Scriptures themselves and the interpretations put upon them by prejudiced, interested or ignorant men. As the "pure in heart" can alone see God, so the open-minded truth-seeker and truth-lover is alone fitted to perceive the meaning of his word.

The great Italian poet has said of twisted expositions of Holy Writ:

"Men thus at variance with the truth
Dream, tho' their eyes be open; reckless some
Of error; others well aware they err.
Each the known track of sage philosophy
Deserts, and has a by way of his own.
Yet this, offensive as it is, provokes
Heaven's anger less than when the sacred Book
Is forced to yield to man's authority,
Or from its straightness warped."—*Dante.*

If the Bible does contain contradictory statements or implications, under God's apparent sanction, then, of course, its authority ceases and the known facts of experience and science become the guide of duty. On the contrary, if the Bible is consistent, the consistency may be shown; and we may add, only the denier of its divinity has the moral and logical right to contend that it does sanction the use of strong drink or disturbing drugs. Let us then examine the book with impartiality and record some of the discovered facts that bear on the subject of drink and drinking:

1. The institutes of the Creator are wise; yet in Eden, for the most organically perfect pair, no strong drink was provided; the fruits of the earth were their appointed food, and simple water or "meathes from many a berry" their only but sufficient beverage.

2. It is also the fact that God provided no strong drink for his people, even when wandering in the hot atmosphere of an arid wilderness, but only water from the rock; and even then, from the presence of palm-wine made by the foolish sons of Aaron, "strange fire" was ignited, and the offerers perished, being the occasion of the first recorded prohibition of intoxicants—a divine example which men would do well to follow.

3. In the symbolic rites it was not "wine" that represented "the washing of regeneration," but the "water of life"; while fermentation was the type of moral corruption. (1 Cor. 5: 6–8.)

4. The three chief elements of the most sacred institutes of Jews and Christians were water, bread and fruit, and the law of the Passover (Ex. 12 and 34: 25) commands (1) that the Jews shall consume *matzah*, sweet or fresh things; (2) that *seor* (the sour or ferment) shall be put out of sight; (3) that no *chomets* (fermented thing) shall be used. Strange that a thousand years later the Rabbins narrowed the broad sense of *matzah* into "biscuit," while now some churchmen would fain decree, and do actually contend, that the phrase "fruit of the vine" excludes the juice from its significance, and designates only fermented wine—a dogma in which Christ, fact and science are equally repudiated.

5. In singular contrast with the language of the opponents of abstinence in this age, it is a fact that there is not in the whole 40 books of the Bible one solitary text that condemns the Nazarites' practice, nor one which commends the use of intoxicating wine.

6. The Bible records, in manifold texts, how patriarchs and priests, princes and prophets "went out of the way through wine and strong drink," and in language corresponding to the fact not only urges the inherent evil tendency of the article consumed, but denounces a woe upon those who give it to their neighbors. (Hab. 2: 15.) Such drink is called a "poison," a "deceiver," a "mocker" and

a "defrauder" ("treacherous dealer" in R. V.). The first and last time in which *chemah*, the generic Hebrew term for "poison" occurs, it is applied to intoxicating wine; and in descriptive passages the drink of the drunkard is in fact declared to be a narcotic brain-poison and a paralyzer of the will. "They have beaten me and I *felt it not* . . . I will seek it yet again." (Prov. 23: 35.)

7. The word for "poison" has a metaphorical use in accordance with the literal. It is the word which characterizes the contents of the "cup of wrath," and is expressive of the divine punishment upon sin (Jer. 25: 15, etc.). It was not a "cup of blessing"; and the *toxic* quality is the whole point and meaning of the figure, as in the 14th chapter of the Apocalypse, in which book the philosophy of Prohibition is also distinctly taught. The binding of Satan precedes the millenium of purity and peace. The divine kingdom is always conditioned upon deliverance from evil and from the pressure of perpetual temptation.

8. The philology of the Bible plainly discriminates between good and bad wine. The phrase "pure blood of the grape" cannot point to the same thing as "wine, the poison of dragons"; the wine of "astonishment" (lit., *reeling*) cannot be the same thing as the contents of the "cup of blessing." We must, therefore, distinguish between the Lord's *Kalon-oinon* and Satan's *Kakon-oinon*.

9. The Bible not only discountenances drink and drinking by plain and strong words, and by recording evil results, but commends and commands abstinence in various and emphatic ways. "I raised up your sons for prophets and your young men for Nazarites; is it not even so? saith the Lord." (Amos, 2: 11, 12.) The strong champion Samson was, *before his birth*, appointed by angelic message to be an abstainer, and his mother was prohibited the toxic drink likewise, lest he should suffer pre-natal injury. The Nazarites are described as fair, ruddy and moral. The priests were commanded, on pain of death, to abstain from strong drink while doing God's work in tabernacle and temple; and one greater than a prophet, the forerunner of the Messiah, was made an abstainer "that he might be filled with the Holy Ghost."

10. Abstinence teaching, in various forms, permeates both the Old and New Testaments, as well as the Apocrypha, but especially and distinctly is it inculcated in the letters of Peter and Paul. "We," says the latter, "are 'sons of the day,' and, therefore, should be *Neephomen*, 'no drinkers.'" (1 Thess. 5: 6–8.)

11. Before anything can be proved against abstinence, either as a doctrine or a "counsel of perfection," a test must be adduced which connects together three things—God, sanction and intoxicating quality. God's word is one thing; man's opinion about it is another. God's sanction is one thing—his "permission" another. Divorce, slavery, polygamy, even rebellion, were expressly "allowed." God does not coerce us. Lastly, intoxicating wine is one thing—"good wine" another. Moreover, the Bible, like any other ancient book, must be read in the light of the history of the times in which its various books were written. What the men of that day would understand by words and laws is the question—not what the moderns may wish the words to mean. Now the great illuminating fact in this inquiry is that abstinence was a part of all the great religions of the East—of Egypt, Bactria, Persia, India—and was practiced or taught by the most eminent men of Greece, like Pythagoras and Epicurus.

12. Two centuries before Christ, the following passage from Phylarchus shows that its essential truth penetrated the religion of the Pagan world: "The Greeks who sacrifice to the Sun-God never bring wine to the altars, because it is fitting that the God who keeps the whole universe in order should in no way be connected with drunkenness." (*Historia*, lib. xii.) In the writings of Josephus and Philon the doctrine of abstinence is distinctly taught, and in the very words of the Christian apostles; the early Church at Jerusalem practiced it, and Eusebius, in the 17th chapter of his history, tells us not only that it extensively prevailed amongst the Essenes, but also that it was the practice of the holy apostles.

13. In the light of these historic facts, the contention that Christ, in opposition to the teaching of the prophets and the practice of the Essenes and other pious Jews, should transmute innocent water into toxic wine, by a miraculous brewing, without exciting any remark or inquiry

from either friends or critics, seems the very height of paradox, and cannot be rationally entertained.

14. Drugged drinks are frequently named, but never as comforters, blessings or legitimate luxuries. Mixed wine, however, is shown in Proverbs to be of two sorts—one the syrup-wine mingled with water at Wisdom's feast, the other drugged wine, upon the seekers of which a woe is elsewhere pronounced. No commentators, of any school or church, have failed to see that the Bible condemns such drinks. The last act of the Redeemer was to refuse the "wine mingled with myrrh," though the Jews often administered it to criminals about to perish, to abate their sensibility to pain and fear.

15. The defenders of strong drink endeavor to prejudice the inquiry by putting a false issue before the people, and by assuming an absurd principle of criticism. They write of their own "*One-Wine* theory" and of our "*Two-Wine* theory" —language utterly unmeaning and inapplicable. The real contention is whether the Hebrew words *yayin* and *shekar* are generic or specific terms—a question which only an induction of the terms as used can ever settle. In England, for example, corn is a generic term for grain, which, indeed, is the same word modified; in North America it has become specific, meaning *Indian* corn, not all sorts of grain. If the question were about the quality of a spirit, a wife, a man, a metal or a tree, how would the problem be advanced by a foolish clamor about a "one-spirit" or "two-spirit" theory, a "one-wife" or a "two-wife" theory, etc? The assumption that what a word means in one text it means everywhere else is equally absurd; for it is of the essence of generic terms to be capable of receiving qualifying adjectives. It is the same kind of fallacy as giving a definition with the differentiation left out. As a matter of fact, we have hundreds of examples of the use, during two thousand years, of the word *wine* (in Hebrew, Arabic, Syriac, Greek, Latin, French, German, Spanish and English) for the expressed juice of the grape; and sometimes, in the earliest use, for the *grape-fruit* in the cluster.

16. The expression, "fruit of the vine," as translated from both the Hebrew and the Greek, was applied to the expressed juice of the grape, but was never originally used, like "corn," for the natural fruit—the grape in the cluster. For that purpose a distinct word was employed. In the course of time, through human ignorance, the phrase under consideration came to be applied to the fermented juice of the grape—also called "wine"—because men did not understand the change effected by fermentation, as few do even to-day. When employed by our Saviour, however, we may surely assume that he did not fall into the errors of the Rabbins who "made the law of none effect," but selected that form of wine which was not only innocent but "good."

I close by giving an analysis and contrast of two things, which may help to illuminate the whole subject:

THE SOLID CONSTITUENT PARTS OF VINE-FRUIT:	CONSTITUENTS OF ALCOHOLIC WINE:
I. NATURAL JUICE.	II. FERMENTED JUICE.
Gluten Gum } These totally vanish from the fermented juice.	1 Alcohol, 2 Acetic Acid, 3 Œnanthic-Æther, 4 Succinic Acid, 5 Glycerine.
Albumen . . .	Albumen, 6 pts. out of 7 lost
Sugar	Sugar, 4 out of 5 lost.
Tannin	Tannin, 4 out of 6 lost.
Tartaric Acid . . .	Tartaric Acid, 1 out of 2 lost
Potash Sulphur Phosphorus } These three specially valuable for blood.	Potash Sulphur Phosphorus } One-half less.

At the top of the left-hand column are the names of two constituents not found in the right-hand column. These are wholly destroyed by fermentation, and the first is the distinctive nutritive constituent of the fruit. At the top of the right-hand column will be seen the names of five constituents not contained in the grape. They are new products generated by the destruction of the gluten, gum and other constituents in both columns. Hence, by a triple process of destruction, addition and abstraction (through fermentation) grape-juice loses its essential constituents, and its nutritive character vanishes. In scientific fact, therefore, alcoholic "wine" is not "the fruit of the vine," but an artificial product.

F. R. LEES.

Bible Wines.—1. *Reasons Against the Unfermented-Wine Theory.*—No one in reading the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, without prejudice, would imagine that there were two kinds of wine, intoxicating and the non-intoxicating, mentioned in the holy book. He would find that the same word for wine is used for that which Noah drank to drunkenness, and that which Melchizedek brought forth to Abraham; for that which is called a "mocker," and that which was used as a drink-offering at God's altar; for that which inflames man, and that which makes glad man's heart; for that which figures God's wrath and man's wickedness, and that which figures our Lord's salvation. (See Gen. 9: 24; 14: 18; Prov. 20: 1; Ex. 29: 40; Isa. 5: 11; Ps. 104: 15; Jer. 25: 15; 51: 7; Isa. 55: 1.) In the New Testament he would find the same thing. The same word in Greek is used for that which Jesus drank and made, and that whose excess is deprecated. In neither Testament is the slightest hint given that there was a difference in these drinks. If there had been a difference we should have found a difference in the word used; or, at least, if the word was the same we should have found some adjective or explanatory phrase to warn us of the difference. For example, when Paul rebuked the Corinthian Christians for their drunkenness at the Lord's Supper, how easy it would have been for him to say to them: "Drink only the unintoxicating wine." If there had been a difference between wines, as intoxicating and unintoxicating, it was his apostolic duty to emphasize that distinction at such a crisis. So again, when the same apostle tells the deacons and old women not to use *much* wine (1 Tim. 3: 8; Tit. 2: 3) he must have meant intoxicating wine, for what reason could he frame for cautioning them not to use much innocuous juice? He did not appear to know that there was a non-intoxicating wine. He advises Timothy (not as a physician, but as a friend) to use a "little," and warns against its excessive use. (1 Tim. 5: 23; Eph. 5: 18; comp. 1 Pet. 4: 3.) The little and the excess evidently refer to the same liquid.

That "fruit of the vine," in the accounts of our Lord's Supper (Matt. 26: 29; Mark 14: 25; Luke 22: 18), is the same as *wine*, and only means the wine used at the time, is evident to anyone who knows that the phrase "fruit of the vine" was the Jewish formula for wine at the Paschal feast. The Jews mingled water with the wine at the Passover *to avoid drunkenness*, and the blessing said over it was, "Blessed be he that created *the fruit of the vine.*" Our Saviour simply used the Paschal term for intoxicating wine. (See Lightfoot on Matt. 26: 29.) Herodotus uses the same phrase, "fruit of the vine," for intoxicating wine. He represents queen Tomyris as saying to Cyrus: "Be not elated . . . that by the *fruit of the vine* with which, when filled with it, ye so rave," etc. (Herod. 1: 212). The Greek fathers, who certainly knew what "fruit of the vine" meant, always speak of our Saviour using *wine* at the Supper.

Wine is grape-juice fermented. Grape-juice, left to itself, will ferment. To prevent fermentation and keep its juice there is need of elaborate restrictive processes, and they are these that Pliny and Columella refer to, but nowhere do these and other ancient authors refer to these preserved juices as the wine of commerce and the country. They are extraordinary productions, while wine, intoxicating wine, is the only thing known by the name in the ancient poets and essayists. To prove this by quotation would be to write a book of quotations from scores of writers. And what is true of the ancient heathen writers is true of the early Christian fathers. We find not the slightest hint of two kinds of wine, the intoxicating and the non-intoxicating, in any of them. Clement of Alexandria, who is especially quoted by those who would sustain the two-wine theory, warns the young not to use wine, but never suggests an unintoxicating kind. He says of the one kind, which alone he knows: "Toward evening, about supper-time, wine may be used. But we must not go on to intemperate potations." (Clem. Alex. *Pæd.* 2: 2.) If preserved grape-juice were a common thing in his day, why did not this Christian father urge this as a substitute for intoxicating wine?

In all the poets of Greece and Rome, such as Anacreon and Horace, we find wine constantly mentioned as an intoxicating drink, if taken to excess. No one in reading these classics would ever suspect there were two kinds of wine, the intoxicating and unintoxicating. We cannot prove a negative by quotations. We declare that no ancient author hints even at two kinds of wine, the intoxicating and unintoxicating, as the ordinary wine drunk by the people, and it is for the two-wine advocates to prove their position by a single honest quotation. There have been plenty of twisted quotations unfairly used, but not one honestly quoted with its context that sustains the two-wine theory. The extraordinary preservation of must has been used for the ordinary making of wine. Now must stands to wine just as dough stands to bread; and must may be called wine just as dough may be called bread. One may loosely say to the baker, "Put your bread into the oven" before it is actually bread; and so one may say, "Do not touch my wine," to one who is meddling with the must before it becomes wine. So, also, poetically, one may say, "My vineyard bears the repaying wine;" just as another poet says, "My ship was then the growing trees of the forest." But to suppose that the poet meant the grapes were wine is as wise as to suppose he meant that the growing trees were a ship. We must use common sense in our interpretations. These anticipatory or poetical uses of the word "wine" are found in all writers, but no argument can be founded on their literal truth.

The two-wine theory is a modern affair. It began in our own century with a few excellent men who longed to meet the intemperance of the day with a new argument, and who said that the ordinary interpretation of the word "wine" in the Bible was an obstacle to the theory and practice of total abstinence. They honestly thought that they detected a difference in terms and expressions both in the Hebrew and the Greek, on which they could base their theory. Two or three prominent names, of the highest character and of good scholarship for that day, gave currency to the theory among the less learned philanthropists, who saw no way of escape from the curse of intemperance but by the total denunciation of wine. The temperance literature at once gave wide circulation to this error, and now there are thousands and tens of thousands who firmly believe that both the Bible and the ancient writers generally recognize two kinds of wine, one intoxicating and the other unintoxicating; one to be condemned and the other to be praised. A mighty stream of sentiment has flowed from this little beginning, and its prevalence tends to substantiate it. Many sound and strong minds, who have not personally examined the question, give in their adherence to the utterly unfounded theory. This is the way of an error that becomes inveterate.

We hazard nothing in saying that the present scholarship of the world repudiates the theory in toto. Etymologically, historically and scientifically, the theory is condemned by every scholar who has given his thought and study to it in late years. In a brief article like this it is impossible to take up each department and show the processes and results of careful observation The *onus probandi* belongs to those who assert the theory, which was never heard of until this century. We have examined scores of books that advocate the theory, and have yet to find the first evidence of its truth. It is purely an invention, honestly prompted in minds to which the wish was father to the thought, and naturally grasped by the earnest advocates of total abstinence. We do not wonder at the zeal of such men and women. It is most laudable. A mind that can unmoved see the dreadful evils of intemperance is an unenviable one. Every lover of his race should be most earnest to meet the usages that are destroying both body and soul with such appalling power. We cannot but commend the energy of all who are enlisted to extirpate the baleful influence of the saloon. And yet we should be careful in the warfare to use no improper weapons and to wield no untruth which will only react against us and stop the progress of reform. The two-wine theory, by reason of its baselessness, is, as promulgated, only an advantage to the enemy, who, by overthrowing one weak defense, will impress the public mind that they have conquered in the main strife. If we are to make steady progress we must adhere to truth, and declare wine an evil only in its excessive use; and standing by and with God's word, and by and with the human conscience, too, denounce and hinder excess in every legitimate way. Man's wisdom cannot take the place of God's wisdom.

HOWARD CROSBY.

2. *Reasons for the Unfermented-Wine Theory.*—The study of Bible wines requires notice of their historic mention, the sources of knowledge as to their nature, the methods of their preparation, and their uses as beverages and medicines, and in religious rites. The word "wine" occurs in the English translation of the Old Testament about 200 times, and in

the New Testament about 40 times. Its special nature is to the English reader indicated by associated terms which either directly or indirectly explain its character. Thus, the special terms "new" occurring 18 times and "sweet" 3 times, its association as a fresh product of the field 25 times with "corn" and 29 times with "oil," as also its issuing from the "press" mentioned about 20 times, indicate to the ordinary reader that its nature is to be inferred from these associated statements. Turning to the inspired Hebrew of the Old Testament and to the inspired Greek of the New Testament, the specific meanings of the several terms used, as explained by translators, lexicographers and commentators in successive ages, make specially apparent what the ordinary reader has imperfectly recognized.

In the Hebrew Old Testament no less than ten distinct terms are translated by the word "wine;" only two of which require special attention. The eight less important terms, in the order of the lexicon, are the following: The word *ashishah*, rendered "flagon," used four times, refers doubtless to dried grapes or raisins pressed into cakes. The passages are, 2 Sam. 6: 19; 1 Chron. 16: 3; Cant. 2: 5, and Hos. 3: 1; all of which Fuerst, the latest and ablest in archæology of Hebrew lexicographers, thus interprets, citing as authority both the Greek translation of the LXX and the Talmud. The term *chamra*, Chaldee, used six times by Ezra and Daniel in Babylonia (namely, Ezra 6: 9; 7: 22; Dan. 5: 1, 2, 4, 23), and its cognate Hebrew *chemar*, used three times, once each by Moses (Deut. 32: 14), David (Ps. 75: 8) and Isaiah (Isa. 27: 2), refers unquestionably, as do its cognate Syriac *chamro* and Arabic *chemer* now constantly used, to intoxicating wines. The term *yaqueb*, meaning wine-press, used 16 times, indicates fresh grape-juice issuing from the press. (See Num. 18: 27, 30; Deut. 15: 14; 16: 13; Judges 7: 25; 2 Kings 6: 27; Job 24: 11; Prov. 3: 10; Isa. 5: 2; 16: 10; Jer. 48: 33; Hos. 9: 22; Joel 2: 24; 3: 13; Hag. 2: 16; Zech. 14: 10.) The term *mimesak*, only twice used (Prov. 23: 30; Isa. 65: 11), rendered "mixed wine," indicates a wine made pungent in taste by spices. The word *soba*, three times used (Isa. 1: 22; Hos. 4: 18; Nah. 1: 10), rendered "wine," "drink" and "drunken" and described in Isa. 1: 22 as mixed with water, as the Latin and other translations indicate, is a syrup made of fresh grape-juice, like those used in making effervescing drinks, and common among Mohammedans as the drink called "sherbet." The word *anab*, meaning "grape-cluster," used 18 times, once only translated "wine" (Hos. 3: 1), brings to notice the fresh juice yet in the cluster. (See Gen. 40: 10, 11; 49: 11; Lev. 25: 5; Num. 6: 3; 13: 20, 23; Deut. 23: 24; 32: 14, 32; Neh. 13: 15; Isa. 5: 2, 4; Jer. 8: 13; Hos. 3: 1; 9: 10; Amos 9: 13.) The term *asis*, used five times, rendered "sweet wine" (Isa. 49: 26, and Amos 9: 13), "new wine" (Joel 1: 5, and 3: 18), and "juice" (Cant. 8: 2), derived from *asas* meaning to "press," indicates the fresh juice oozing from the fruit. The word *shemarim*, met five times (Ps. 75: 8; Isa. 25: 6; Jer. 48: 11; Zeph. 1: 12), rendered "dregs," "lees," and "wine on the lees," indicates manifestly the juice in the wine-vat before it is drawn off to be stored.

To these eight terms rendered "wine" in the English version of the Old Testament, must be added three others indicating products of the grape; which, with the preceding, present the succession of products in ancient and modern times—two yet to be considered excepted—derived from the grape referred to in Old Testament history and precept, poetry and prophecy. The word *debsh* is met 54 times. (See Gen. 43: 11; Ex. 3: 8, 17; 13: 5; 16: 31; 33: 3; Lev. 2: 11; 20: 24; Num. 13: 27; 14: 8; 16: 13, 14; Deut. 6: 3; 8: 8; 11: 9; 26: 9, 15; 27: 3; 31: 20; 32: 13; Josh. 5: 6; Judges 14: 8, 9, 18; 1 Sam. 14: 25, 26, 27, 29, 43; 2 Sam. 17: 29; 1 Kings 14: 3; 2 Kings 18: 32; 2 Chron. 31: 5; Job 20: 17; Ps. 19: 10; 81: 16; 119: 103; Prov. 16: 24; 24: 13; 25: 16, 27; Cant. 4: 11; 5: 1; Isa. 7: 15, 22; Jer. 11: 5; 32: 22; 41: 8; Ezek. 3: 3; 16: 13, 19; 20: 6, 15; 27: 17.) Its abundance in the early history of Israel, and its apparent supplanting, at least as a beverage, by *tirosh* in Nehemiah's age, is significant. It is rendered "honey," and is in all instances except one, the modern Arabic *dibs*, a sauce of stewed grapes with or without the skins, though usually strained juice—the same juice in Judges 14: 8, 9, 18 being, as now on all the shores of the Mediterranean, extracted by the bee instead of man.

The term *shekar*, strong drink, as indicated specially by the Greek translation of the Old Testament made two and a half centuries before Christ and quoted by Him and His Apostles, was a highly intoxicating wine. It is alluded to 23 times in the Old Testament. (See Lev. 9: 10; Num. 6: 3; 28: 7; Deut. 14: 26; 29: 6; Judg. 13: 4, 7, 14; 1 Sam. 1: 15; Ps. 69: 12; Prov. 20: 1; 31: 4, 6; Isa. 5: 11, 22; 24: 9; 28: 7; 29: 9; 56: 12; Mic. 2: 11.) The corresponding verb *shakar* is used 19 times. (Gen. 9: 21; 43: 34; Deut. 32: 42; 1 Sam. 1: 14; 2 Sam. 11: 13; Cant. 5: 1; Isa. 29: 9; 49: 26; 51: 21; 63: 6; Jer. 25: 27; 51: 7, 21, 39, 57; Lam. 4: 21; Nah. 3: 11; Hab. 2: 15; Hag. 1: 6.) It is rendered "drunken," except in Cant. 5: 1, where it is rendered correctly, as the connection shows, "drink abundantly"—a meaning confirmed by the figurative use in Deut. 32: 42. *Shekar* or *sikera* in Greek is found only once (Luke 1: 15) in the New Testament citation from the Old Testament.

The term *chomets*, derived from the verb *chamets*, meaning "to leaven," refers to and is rendered "vinegar"—French *vin gar* or sour wine—which is the ultimate product of the grape when the alcohol of transient ferment is transformed into acetic acid. It is found five times. (Num. 6: 3; Ruth 2: 14; Psa. 69: 21; Prov. 10: 26; 25: 20.) The verb *chamets* is found eight times, and is rendered literally "leavened" in Ex. 12: 19, 20, 34, 39, and Hos. 7: 4, but is figuratively rendered "cruel" in Psa. 71: 4, and "grieved" in Psa. 73: 21—mental agitation acting like leaven--while it is rendered "dyed" in Isa. 63: 1, since the grape-juice exposed to the air soon becomes acetic acid or vinegar. The noun *chamets*, found ten times, is rendered "leavened bread" in Ex. 12: 15; 13: 3, 7; 23: 18; Lev. 7: 13; Deut. 16: 3; and "leaven" in Ex. 34: 25; Lev. 2: 11; 6: 17; 23: 17; Amos 4: 5, this latter meaning justifying the conclusion that fermented wine as well as bread was excluded from the Hebrew festivals.

The two terms on which the interpretation of the important laws and precepts of the Old Testament as to the use of wine turns, both as a beverage and at religious festivals, are *tirosh* and *yayin*. *Tirosh* is used 38 times. (See Gen. 27: 28, 37; Num. 18: 12; Deut. 7: 13; 11: 14; 12: 17; 14: 23; 18: 4; 28: 51; 33: 28; Judg. 9: 13; 2 Kings 18: 32; 2 Chron. 31: 5; 32: 28; Neh. 5: 11; 10: 37, 39; 13: 5, 12; Ps. 4: 7; Prov. 3: 10; Isa. 24: 7; 36: 17; 62: 8; 65: 8; Jer. 31: 12; Hos. 2: 8, 9, 22; 4: 11; 7: 14; 9: 2; Joel 1: 10; 2: 19, 24; Mic. 6: 15; Hag. 1: 11; Zech. 9: 17.)

Tirosh is first mentioned by the English word "wine" in Isaac's blessing, Gen. 27: 28, 37; it occurs throughout the entire history of Israel, and is specially prominent at two eras when Israel reached Canaan, in Nehemiah and in the prophets from Isaiah to Zechariah. The entire history of translations, of renderings by lexicographers and of Hebrew and Oriental Christian commentators, confirms the belief that *tirosh* is unfermented wine. Fuerst, the latest and best archæological lexicographer, renders it *ungegorener wein*, "unfermented wine." This was prepared, as representations to the life on Egyptian tomb-walls indicate, by drawing off from the top of the vat through a strainer, or in a twisted sack, the sweet watery juice of the grapes, dipping it at once into oiled jars, and covering it with a film of olive oil—a method now revived and employed by New York importers from Italy and Spain. This method was tested in February, 1881, at the Columbia College School of Mines, New York, when strained grape-juice put up in a glass phial covered with olive oil in October, 1879, was found not to have the least trace of alcoholic fermentation. The only exception urged in modern discussion has been based on the interpretation of *tirosh* in the Greek translation of Hos. 9: 11 by the word *methusma*, and the translation in the Latin Vulgate of *methusma* by *ebrietas*, or partial intoxication. This objection is removed by the statement of Stephanus in his Greek *Thesaurus*, issued at Paris, 1575. Stephanus, though a Roman Catholic scholar, correcting this translation, thus declares: "*Methusma ebrietas quidem redditur in VV LL; sed absque ullo exemplo aut nomine auctoris—Methusma* is indeed rendered in ancient versions by *ebrietas*, but without any example or the name of an authority."

The other mainly important Hebrew term for wine is *yayin*, used no less than 141 times. (See Gen. 9: 21, 24; 14: 18; 19: 32, 33, 34, 35; 27: 25; 49: 11, 12; Ex. 29: 40; Lev. 10: 9; 23: 13; Num. 6:

3, 4, 20; 15: 5, 7, 10; 28: 14; Deut. 14: 26; 28: 39; 29: 6; 32: 33, 38; Josh. 9: 4, 13; Judg. 13: 4, 7, 14; 19: 19; 1 Sam. 1: 14, 15, 24; 10: 3; 16: 20; 25: 18, 37; 2 Sam. 13: 28; 16: 1, 2; 1 Chron. 9: 29; 12: 40; 27: 27; 2 Chron. 2: 10, 15; 11: 11; Neh. 2: 1; 5: 15, 18; 13: 15; Esther 1: 7, 10; 5: 6; 7: 2, 7, 8; Job. 1: 13, 18; 32: 19; Ps. 60: 3; 75: 8; 78: 65; 104: 15; Prov. 4: 17; 9: 2, 5; 20: 1; 21: 17; 23: 20, 30, 31; 31: 4, 6; Eccl. 2: 3; 9: 7; 10: 19; Cant. 1: 2, 4; 2: 4; 4: 10; 5: 1; 7: 9; 8: 2; Isa. 5: 11, 12, 22; 16: 10; 23: 13; 24: 9, 11; 28: 1, 7; 29: 9; 51: 21; 55: 1; 56: 12; Jer. 13: 12; 23: 9; 25: 15; 35: 2, 5, 6, 8, 14; 40: 10, 12; 48: 33; 51: 7; Lam. 2: 12; Ezek. 27: 18; 44: 21; Dan. 1: 5, 8, 16; 10: 3; Hos. 4: 11; 7: 5; 9: 4; 14: 7; Joel 1: 5; 3: 3; Amos. 2: 8, 12; 5: 11; 6: 6; 9: 14; Mic. 2: 11; 6: 15; Hab. 2: 5; Zeph. 1: 13; Hag. 2: 12; Zech. 9: 15; 10: 7.) *Yayin,* in fact, like "wine" in English, is the generic term covering *all kinds of wine,* whose varieties are indicated specially in the age of Solomon and in his three inspired books. As all lexicographers allow, *yayin* is cognate with Greek *oinos,* Latin *vinum,* Italian and Spanish *vino,* French *vin,* German *wein* and English "wine."

The proofs that *yayin* was a term covering all kinds of wine are these: *First,* It is not found in any of the languages of the Hebrew or Semitic family,—ancient Chaldee, Aramaean or modern Syriac and Arabic. *Second,* The family of Abraham in Canaan were brought into contact with Phœnecian and Egyptian trade, carried on with all the nations bordering on the Mediterranean from Greece westward; so that *yayin* was introduced among the Hebrews alone of the Semitic family, alike in the days of Abraham, of Moses, of Solomon and of Joel; and Joel, 800 years before Christ and only 700 years after Moses, alludes (3: 6) to commerce with the "Grecians" as an ancient traffic. *Third,* The term *yayin* manifestly includes *tirosh,* as a single palpable instance proves. In Num. 18: 12 Moses ordains that offerings for the use of the Levites and Tabernacle service shall be in *quality* of *cheleb tirosh,* or fresh unfermented wine; the word *cheleb* being now used by Arab servants in asking for "fresh" milk, meat or any perishable article of food. Again, in Num. 28: 14, where the *quantity,* not the quality of the drink is made prominent, it is said that it shall be "half a hin of *yayin.*" Every jurist interpreting this book of law, as many like Grotius in ages past have done, would rule that the specific statute as to quality cannot be set aside by the general statute as to quantity. The accumulated proofs that *yayin* is not restricted to intoxicating wine, but that, like its cognate terms *oinos, vinum, vino, vin, wein,* and *wine,* in all ancient and modern languages, it is used for wines of every character, is made demonstrable in this example. That *yayin,* in the following passages, does not refer to intoxicating wine, but as in Num. 28: 14 to an unintoxicating product of the grape, is shown by the context, by the associated history and by the testimony of the ablest commentators in successive ages. The wine of Gen. 14: 18 cannot be that of 9: 21, this incident being regarded as prefiguring the Passover and Lord's Supper. The washing of garments in *yayin,* Gen. 49: 11, is parallel to the use of *chamets* in Isa. 63: 1. The association of *yayin* with fresh products of the field (as in 1 Chron. 9: 29; 12: 40; 27: 27; 2 Chron. 2: 15; Neh. 13: 15; Jer. 40: 10, 12; Lam. 2: 12; Hag. 2: 12) has always attested to Hebrew and Christian scholars a fresh product of the grape. The store of "all sorts of *yayin*" (Neh. 5: 18) is a declaration as palpable in Hebrew as in Italian, French or English, that *yayin* covers every variety of wine. The terms used with *yayin* (Psa. 104: 15), as well as its association with oil and bread, have led both Hebrew and Christian commentators to the assurance that an unintoxicating wine is referred to. The purity of the youthful affection pictured in Canticles, the poem of Solomon's true, early love, the country life pictured among vineyards, as well as laws of interpretation, have restrained in all ages the thought that intoxicating wine is referred to in the mention of *yayin* seven times in this "Song of Songs which is Solomon's." The heaven-wide contrast between *yayin* in Isa. 55: 1 and in 28: 1; 56: 12, has never permitted any interpreter to regard the wine referred to as the same. The failing of *yayin* (Jer. 48: 33) is certainly the failing of the harvest of grape-clusters. The *yayin* which Daniel refused (1: 5, 8) certainly is not the *yayin* which he drank as an ordinary beverage (10: 8) except during his fast.

In the English version of the New Testament, the term "wine" occurs 44 times —21 times unassociated, ten times with "new," twice with "good," three times with "oil," five times with "press," once with "fat" or "vat," twice in the compound word "wine-bibber," and once in "excess of wine." The Greek term for wine, with a single exception, in all cases used in the inspired New Testament, is *oinos*; this term covering, as do all its cognate terms in other languages, *every variety of wine.* It occurs uncompounded 33 times; eight times associated with *neos*, "new," and twice with *kalos*, rendered "good;" once associated with *lenos*, "press;" also three times in compounds, in *oinopotes* ("wine-bibber"), and once in *oinophlugia* ("excess of wine"). In the English version the term rendered "new wine" (Acts 2: 13) is *gleukos*, or a drink grape-syrup; the term *lenon*, rendered "wine-press," has the Greek *oinon* only in Rev. 19: 15; and the term rendered "wine-vat" (Mark 12: 1) is *hypolenion.*

The fact that *oinos* covers every variety of wine is demonstrated: *First*, from usage in classic Greek; *second*, from the Greek translation used by Christ and his apostles, in which *tirosh*, which had no intoxicating element, is generally rendered by *oinos; third*, from Latin terms used in allusion to unfermented wines described by Roman writers from Cato (B. C. 200) to Pliny (A. D. 100); *fourth*, from the usage of Mark, who, writing for Romans familiar with their own unfermented wines, calls the beverage offered to Christ when nailed to the cross *oinos* (15: 23), while Matthew uses the term *oxos*, still called in French *vin-gar*, sour wine; though in vinegar, the last natural and divinely-ordered product of grape-juice, the alcohol developed in the temporary process of fermentation is converted into acetic acid.

The application of these attested facts and principles to the divine precepts concerning wine used as a beverage, as a medicine and as a symbol in religious rites, may be concisely stated. (1) The error of Noah (Gen. 9: 20–27) and its influence on his three sons is universally traced by Hebrew and early Christian writers in Palestine and the East to the specially significant statement of Moses, in harmony with all his history from Eden to Egypt—"Noah *began* to be a husbandman;" inexperience, guarded by no such express command like that given to Adam the first head of the human race, being the natural and excusable cause of the fall of the second head of the human race. (2) The second stage in this history of Moses, "learned in all the wisdom of Egypt," has led to statements from ancient Hebrew and Christian equally well attested, that in the age when unfermented wine, known to Moses in Egypt, had received the specific name *tirosh* used by Isaac (Gen. 27: 28, 37) it was also the *yayin* brought forth by Melchizedek to Abraham (Gen. 15: 18); the same writers seeing in this a precursor of the Passover and Lord's Supper provision. (3) The fall of Lot through the temptation of his erring daughters, recognized as parallel to that of Eve (Gen. 19: 34, 35), is as universally attested to have been the point of contrast between two kinds of wine, since the "vine" is not affected on the hills of Sodom by other causes than in the neighboring valley of Eshcol (Deut. 32: 32, 33, 38), one kind being used by pure men like Melchizedek, and an opposite kind by the debauched in Sodom. (4) The life of Joseph in Egypt brings out the fact, before his day inscribed on the tomb-walls of Egypt, with whose scenes in real life Moses was familiar when he wrote of the fresh grape-cluster pressed into Pharaoh's cup (Gen. 40: 11, 13). (5) It is significant that when the second Passover was observed at Mt. Sinai (Num. 9: 5) it was in accord with the prospective direction that it was to be annually observed only when they came into the Land of Promise (Ex. 12: 24–27; Lev. 23: 9–14); that at the second observance the people had still stores brought out of Egypt (Ex. 12 : 36; Lev. 7: 1–80; 9 : 3), after which no Passover was or could be observed till they had entered into the land of wheat and of the vine (Josh. 5: 10, 11). (6) It is yet more significant that immediately preceding the observance of this second Passover, the law for the Nazarites, who never drank intoxicating wine, as did not the Egyptian priests with whom they had been associated for generations, is given; that law exempting them from the extreme vow of tasting nothing made from the grape, though in the days of Samson, of Samuel, of Elijah, of Jeremiah, of Daniel and of devout Jews after Christ's coming, abstinence from *intoxicating* wine was required. (Num. 6 : 3, 4, 13; Judg. 13: 4, 7, 14; 1 Sam. 1: 11, 15; Jer. 35: 1, 19; Dan. 1: 8; 10: 3; Luke 1: 15; Acts 21: 24–26.) (7) It is yet more to be carefully and conscientiously noted, that it was directly after this law for the Nazarites, and when these gifts from reserved stores for the second Passover were exhausted, that the spies entered Canaan and brought from Eshcol the clustered grapes; on which palpable occasion the special law as to the *quality* of wine offerings, now indicated as possible when they should come into that land of the vine, was written; soon after which the general statute as to *quantity* was, in the same connection, added by Moses (Num. 13: 23, 24; 18: 12; 28: 14). That law as to the *quality* of wine-offering to be brought, for the priests' use as well as for the public festivals, requires that it be *cheleb tirosh;* the English, like other versions, making the word *cheleb* an adjective, as does Fuerst in his Lexicon; *cheleb* in modern Arabic meaning "fresh" as applied to milk, etc.

A clear light is thus, by this meaning of *yayin*, cast on the writings of David, Solomon and the prophets, who condemned always the use of intoxicating wine and commended the simple "cup" of the country laborers, which was the fresh grape-juice now pressed into the "overrunning cup" in Southern France, Spain, and Italy, and also brought now fresh and unfermented from Mediterranean ports to New York. The reader has only to contrast the statements of the same writers to see this truth demonstrated, comparing Psalm 75: 8 with 23: 5 and 104: 15; again Prov. 20: 1 and 23: 29, 31 with Cant. 5: 1 and 7: 9; again, Dan. 1: 5 with 10: 3; again, Neh. 2: 1 with 5: 18 and 13: 15; a contrast which the wayfaring man sees, and, if pure in heart, he heeds.

There is but one plain allusion in the Old Testament to wine used as a *medicine* (Prov. 31:6), and this is in perfect accord with the laws of the priests of Egypt and of India, with both of which Solomon had commerce; intoxicating wine being used only, as afterwards among the Greeks and Romans, to produce stupefaction and rest to the nerves in acute pain, as in strangury, and as an anæsthetic in surgical operations, when deadness to sensibility was necessary. In the New Testament it is inconceivable that Jesus should, in example and precept, have been behind the law of Greeks and of Roman moralists in his use and teachings as to intoxicating wine; as it is inconceivable that he should have appointed for his Supper a wine that would have excluded from his church his chosen forerunner. The five incidents of Christ's life and teachings, which attest Christ's law as to wines, are among the clearest in the New Testament, being especially explained by Christian writers from the 2d to the 6th centuries. *First,* The wine which He made for the wedding (Jno. 2. 10) is by divine guidance ruling the writer John, as well as in the statement of the governor of the feast, which John heard, designated as *kalon.* The same word is distinctively applied by Christ to *fruit* (Matt. 7:16, 20); Jesus with manifest design using the term *agathon,* "permanently good," as applied to the tree, but the word *kalon,* "beautiful," for the fruit, which is good only when fresh and unaffected by decay. The inspired disciples of Jesus, therefore, manifestly recognized that as fruit-juice unexpressed, so fruit-juice expressed is good only when fresh. *Second,* The "new wine" preserved in "new bottles" (Matt. 9:17 and Mark 2:22), in which the term "new" is necessarily added to both wine and bottles for the contrast, is an attestation of the existence and use of oiled-skin bottles, as Origen states; which oiled skins preserved wine from ferment. *Third,* The charge that Jesus was a "wine-bibber" (Matt. 11: 19 and Luke 7: 34) is united with three other charges, recognized as calumnies, namely, that he was "gluttonous," "avaricious" and "licentious;" calumnies revived by Marcion, the apostate, in the 2d century, and from that day in every age fully answered. *Fourth,* The provision for the communion of the Lord's Supper is never alluded to as "wine," but as the "cup," both of the Hebrew Passover and of Christian communion. It is significantly designated as the "fruit of the vine," figuratively and literally "new," to be drunk in Christ's coming kingdom; all of which statements are declared by early Christian writers as making it clear that the unfermented wine of the Passover is to be that of the communion (Matt. 26:27, 29; Mark 14:23, 25 and Luke 22:17, 18, 20); whose special significance, as the early Christian writers note, is emphasized by Christ's allusion to himself as the "vine" (John 15:1), from which the pure "fruit of the vine," alike in the cup and its symbol, flows for man. *Fifth,* The refusal by Christ of a palliative at the commencement of his agony on the cross, and its reception only when he was expiring, to which is added the statement that this palliative called *oinos,* "wine," by Mark, was *oxos,* "vinegar," as stated by Matthew and John, who were eye-witnesses. These cumulative and combined statements have in all ages led to the recognition of this double fact: (1) that the wine Christ drank in life was the pure fruit of the vine; and (2) that even the unintoxicating palliative was refused that his suffering might be perfect.

There are only two allusions to wine in the apostolic writings requiring notice. The first is Paul's allusion to the Corinthian feast made to precede the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 11:21-26), in which the term wine is not used, while the Greek term *methuo,* in English rendered "drunken," is opposed to "hungry," referring to the food, not to the drink provided; and it means simply "gorged." The second noteworthy allusion is to medicinal wine (1 Tim. 5:23); which wine, as Greek medical writers from Hippocrates to Galen state, and as French medical writers now note, was made from fresh unfermented juice of the grape.

G. W. SAMSON.

Black, James, the first candidate of the Prohibition party for President of the United States. He was born in Lewisburg, Pa., Sept. 23, 1823. He lived upon a farm until 12 years of age, occasionally working as a canal-driver during the summer months. Removing with his parents to Lancaster, Pa., in 1836, he found employment in a sawmill and earned enough to engage a private teacher to give him instruction during the winter. Two years later he entered the Lancaster High School. In 1839, at the age of 16, he joined an engineer corps at work upon the Susquehanna and Tide-Water Canal, and his savings enabled him in 1841 to enter the Lewisburg Academy, which he attended for three years. In 1844 he began the study of the law, and in 1846 was admitted to practice at the bar in Lancaster, where he has since resided. His success in his profession and in other pursuits has placed him in comfortable circumstances. When a lad of 16 years he was associated with drinking engineers. He was once intoxicated, but that experience was sufficient to make him a total abstainer for the remainder of his life, and a radical temperance worker. In 1840 he joined the Washingtonians, the first temperance organization in his neighborhood. In 1846 he helped to institute a division of the Sons of Temperance. Prominent in the "Maine law" Prohibitory movement of 1852 in Pennsylvania, Mr. Black was that year elected Chairman of the Lancaster County Prohibition Committee by a convention of men determined to carry the temperance question into politics and secure a State Prohibitory law like Maine's. A temperance legislative ticket having been nominated, Mr. Black, a few days later, made his first public Prohibition speech. It was largely due to Mr. Black's personal efforts that the Maine law movement became popular in Lancaster County and resulted, in 1855, in the election of two of the five temperance legislative candidates. Besides making speeches and writing for the cause, Mr. Black sometimes contributed as much as $500 yearly to it.

The Anti-Slavery agitation about this time, and the Civil War a little later, interrupted the temperance work and engaged the attention and interest of Mr. Black. He aided in organizing the Republican party in Pennsylvania, and was a delegate to the first National Conventon of that party in 1856. He was a Republican in politics until the formation at Chicago in September, 1869, of the National Prohibition party. He was chosen Permanent President of this body. At the new party's Columbus (O.) Convention, in February, 1872, Mr. Black was nominated as its candidate for President of the United States, and in the election that followed he received 5,608 votes. For the four years from 1876 to 1880 he was Chairman of the National Committee of the Prohibition party.

He has also been an active temperance worker outside strict party lines. He was one of the founders of the National Temperance Society and Publication House. In a paper read in a National Convention held at Saratoga, in 1865, he presented the plan of this society, and he afterwards prepared its charter, constitution, by-laws, rules of publication, etc., and was Chairman of the Committee appointed to secure a capital of $100,000 as a basis of operations. Having identified himself with the Good Templars in 1858, two years later Mr. Black was elected Grand Worthy Chief Templar of Pennsylvania, a position which he held for four successive years. In 1864 he prepared and presented to President Lincoln a memorial for the abolition of the whiskey rations in the United States army. Mr. Black's "Cider Tract" caused the Good Templars to declare against the use of cider as a beverage. Prominent as a layman in the Methodist Episcopal Church, he was one of the 26 who in 1869 organized the Ocean Grove Camp Meeting Association, under whose auspices one of the most delightful seaside resorts of the country is conducted.

Mr. Black owns probably the largest collection of temperance literature contained in any private library in the world, about 1,200 volumes being included in it. Among the works published by him are a pamphlet entitled, "Is there a Necessity for a Prohibition Party?" (1875); "Brief History of Prohibition" (1880), and "History of the Prohibition Party" (1885).

Blue Ribbon Movements.—A distinguishing feature of many of the movements for the reformation of drinking men has been the bit of ribbon, generally blue or red, worn by the reformed men and others interested. The red ribbon was adopted by Dr. Henry A. Reynolds, Sept. 10, 1874, as the badge of the Bangor (Me.) Reform Club, which he organized at that time, and which, consisting of reformed drinking men, was the first club of its kind ever formed. Throughout the remarkable pledge-signing campaigns that followed in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Mighigan, Illinois and other States, Dr. Reynolds made the red ribbon the sign of membership in the clubs he started, and they came to be known as Red Ribbon Reform Clubs. The white ribbon was adopted by Dr. Reynolds in connection with the red, the former to be worn by women and by young men under 18. The white ribbon is also worn by all ladies of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. But the blue ribbon has been associated with temperance reform movements more extensively than any other badge. It was adopted by Francis Murphy, and has been donned by very many thousands in this country whom he has induced to sign the pledge.

The idea was borrowed in England. On Feb. 10, 1878, a conference of temperance workers was held in London and a total abstinence campaign was determined on. A central mission was to be established in London with town organizations in the provinces as the work spread. The blue ribbon was chosen, and the "Blue Ribbon Army" was adopted as the name of the organization. Mr. William Noble, who took a prominent part in the inauguration of this work, had recently returned from a visit to the United States, where he had seen something of the methods employed in the Murphy and Reynolds movements. Pledge-cards were issued and scattered throughout the British Empire, and during the years since they have been translated into several languages, and have found their way into various countries of Europe, into Africa and the Sandwich Islands. More than 1,000,000 pledges have been officially issued, in addition to the pledges issued by independent workers co-operating with the movement. A change in the name from "Blue Ribbon Army" to "Blue Ribbon Gospel Temperance Movement" has been made, and several branch organizations, such as the "Help-Myself Society" among men, and the "Help-One-Another Society" among women, have grown out of the original movement.[1]

Brandy.—See SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS.

Brewing.—The process of changing grains or fruits to fermented liquor. It has been known and practised from very early times. The process of brewing beer involves two chief operations:

1. *Producing the Malt.*—This includes four successive steps: (1) *Steeping* the grain in water for two or three days, to swell and soften it. (2) *Couching* or throwing swollen grain into a large heap where, in one or two days, it will sweat

---

[1] The editor is indebted to Mr. William Noble for particulars of the Blue Ribbon work in Great Britain.

and begin to germinate. (3) *Flooring,* or spreading it to an even depth of 12 to 16 inches, to favor more rapid germination. It is sometimes stirred with shovels and spread over a wider surface, to prevent unequal heating and too rapid growth. This stage requires two or three weeks. (4) *Kiln-drying,* or spreading it from 4 to 10 inches thick on a stone or metallic floor, perforated and made so hot as to kill the grain-germ and check further growth. The starch has now been changed to sugar. The process is called "malting," and the grain is called "malt."

2. *Brewing the Malt.*—Six distinct operations are involved: (1) *Crushing* the malt between two iron cylinders. (2) *Mashing,* or mixing the crushed material with warm water, to extract the saccharine matter. The mixture is now called "sweet wort." (3) *Boiling* the wort with hops, the object being to convert any residuary starch into sugar, and to extract from the hops certain elements which give the liquor a bitter flavor and tend to preserve it. (4) *Cooling* the wort, which must be done very rapidly to prevent acidity. (5) *Fermenting* the liquid, drawn off into vats of various kinds, and kept at a temperature of 60° to 70° F. To produce fermentation, from 1 to 1½ per cent. of yeast is added. (6) *Clearing* and storing. Impurities are carried off through an orifice left at the top for that purpose. The resulting liquid is beer, ready now to be stored in oaken barrels.

Briggs, George N.—Born in Adams, Mass., April 13, 1796; died Sept. 12, 1861. He was of humble parentage, and in his youth served an apprenticeship to a hatmaker. As Governor of Massachusetts from 1844 to 1851, his whole influence was exercised to promote total abstinence, and no liquors were given to his guests. While in Congress he became President of the Congressional Temperance Society.

British Columbia.—See CANADA.

British Women's Temperance Association.—This Association was founded by a conference of ladies at Newcastle-on-Tyne, April 21, 1876. The purpose of the conference was to effect a federation of all women's temperance organizations based on total abstinence, it being believed that by such united effort more could be accomplished to promote temperance and suppress the liquor traffic. The Association is entirely unsectarian, and welcomes all women who will accept its simple pledge and work for the common cause. An annual business meeting is held every May in London, and an autumnal meeting in some provincial town. Organizing agents are engaged in forming new branches and encouraging old ones. The official organ of the Association is the *British Women's Temperance Journal* (London), published monthly at one penny a copy. Among the other publications are the *Non-Alcoholic Cookery Book,* and a wall-card of "Simple Remedies," both intended to show that alcohol is equally unnecessary in food and medicine. The Association has sent numerous petitions to Parliament for the repeal of licenses and the concession of Sunday-closing, and has also urged clergymen to use unfermented wine for sacramental purposes. The local branches are engaged in all forms of beneficient endeavor, and the work done by them includes the cultivation of total abstinence sentiment and practice through gospel temperance missions, public meetings, medical lectures, drawing-room meetings, garden parties, meetings in young ladies' schools, Bands of Hope and other societies for the young, cottage and factory meetings, sewing classes, tract distribution, etc. The branches also make appeals to magistrates at the annual licensing sessions. Several homes for intemperate women have been established. The thirteenth annual report (for the year ending April 30, 1889) shows a total of 409 affiliated societies, with a membership of about 30,000, all officered and conducted by women. The gross receipts for the year were £708 11s. 7d. Mrs. Margaret Bright (See LUCAS, MARGARET BRIGHT.)

Brooks, John Anderson, the fifth candidate of the Prohibition party for Vice-President of the United States, born in Germantown, Ky., June 3, 1836. His father was of Irish and Welsh descent, and combined the occupations of farmer, lawyer and preacher, but derived from them only a meagre support. Despite the disadvantages of his early years the boy was resolved to rise. When 12 years old he joined a debating society, and soon became a proficient speaker. At 16 he made temperance speeches. At the age of 17 he entered Bethany College, and three years later (1856) he graduated with honors. While in college he participated in the heated discussions of the slavery issue, taking the view that the negro was an inferior being and championing slavery and the customs and traditions of the South. But he advocated free speech and honorable treatment of opponents, and on one occasion risked his life to rescue an Abolitionist from a pro-slavery mob. Although he had looked forward to fitting himself for the legal profession, he decided, after his conversion to Christianity under the preaching of Alexander Campbell, to enter the ministry, and accordingly he became a clergyman of the sect known as Christians or Disciples. He began his work in his native town, and for several years afterwards was engaged in successful evangelistic labor. In 1857 he was married, but his young wife died three weeks after the wedding. Two years later he married again. During two years of the Civil War he was President of the college at Flemingsburg, Ky. His sympathies were with the South, but he extended hospitalities to soldiers on both sides. Afterwards he filled pastorates at Winchester, Ky., and at St. Louis, Mexico, Warrensburg and Bolton in the State of Missouri. He is now minister of a large church in Kansas City, Mo.

From his youth he was an ardent temperance advocate, and at different times he was connected with the Sons of Temperance, Good Templars and the Francis Murphy pledge-signing movement. In Missouri he was identified with the various Prohibitory movements growing out of the Convention at Sedalia, July 4, 1880. At that convention the Missouri Prohibition Alliance was organized, with Dr. Brooks as its President. A notable agitation followed, and, without salary and at his own risk, he canvassed the State, speaking in 100 counties. The first year's work resulted in the election of a Legislature pledged to submit a Prohibitory Amendment to the people; but treachery in the State Senate caused the defeat of the submission bill, and the Downing High License law was enacted as a compromise. After three more years of energetic work Dr. Brooks (1884), received an independent Prohibition nomination for Governor of Missouri. Although there had been no previous organization of the Prohibition party in the State, and although the entire vote of Missouri for the Prohibition Presidential ticket in 1884 was only 2,153, Dr. Brooks polled 10,426 votes.

In the next four years he worked earnestly and with excellent results to promote Prohibition sentiment throughout the country, making addresses in many States. At the National Convention of the Prohibition party, held at Indianapolis, May 30 and 31, 1888, he was nominated for Vice-President on the ticket with Gen. Clinton B. Fisk. He made many speeches during the campaign. His record as a Southern sympathizer in slavery times was persistently used against him by political enemies, and the most unscrupulous misrepresentations and attacks were made. Yet he had unequivocally repudiated his former views.

Burmah.—Drink appears to have been unknown among the Burmese until southern Burmah was conquered by the English in the early part of the present century. Then liquor came in like a flood. One reason for its rapid spread was given to me by an old native schoolteacher, for many years past a Christian. "We saw," said he, "that the English armies were stronger than ours, and that man for man they were better physically than we. The main difference in habit was that they drank alcoholic drinks and we did not; so we concluded that must make the difference, and we began drinking deliberately for the purpose of strengthening ourselves. But a few years showed us that we had made a great mistake, and we drink much less now than we did years ago." King Thebaw kept drink out of Upper Burmah as long as he was in power; but as soon as the English came in a brewery was erected near Mandalay "to supply the British soldiers with beer." Very soon shops were open for the sale of all sorts of intoxicating drinks, and no restriction was placed upon the sale to natives. This I saw on my visit to that city in June, 1887, when the first temperance society—a Woman's Christian Temperance Union—was organized. The Presbyterian chaplain to the forces was then doing good work in the garrison. In June, 1889, Miss Phenney commenced the publication, in Burmese, of monthly Band of Hope leaflets. Each contains a temperance song and a series of questions and answers on the effects of alcohol, opium, tobacco, etc., on the human system. About 500 of these leaflets are used every month, in 16 different schools and in 12 different stations, from Mandalay in Upper Burmah to Tavoy in Lower Burmah. MARY CLEMENT LEAVITT.

Cadets of Temperance.—This society of juveniles originated with the Sons of Temperance in 1843, but has grown into an independent organization. By its constitution young persons (of either sex) of good moral character, between the ages of 12 and 21 years, are eligible to membership. Every person, in joining, is required to take an obligation not to drink, as a beverage, any intoxicating liquor, wine or cider, so long as he remains a member. Many of the States and several of the Canadian Provinces have branches. The Order is sub-divided into Grand Sections and Sections. The entire membership is about 10,000. Pennsylvania is the banner State. The present national officers (March, 1891) are: Most Worthy Patron, Charles C. Augustine, Philadelphia; Most Worthy Vice-Patron, Frank E. Parker, Charlestown, Mass.; Most Worthy Secretary, Fred. J. King, Philadelphia; Most Worthy Treasurer, J. H. Courtenay, New York City.

California.—See Index.

Canada.—A slight knowledge of certain prominent physical and political characteristics of the Dominion of Canada is necessary to a clear comprehension of the position of the temperance cause in the Dominion. Canada covers an area a little less in extent than that of the United States. It includes, besides an enormous extent of unorganized territory, seven Provinces, each with a separate Legislature and Government, but all united for national purposes under a Federal Parliament. The population of the Dominion is about 4,500,000. Partly because of geographical conditions this population may be considered as separated into four groups, (1) The Maritime Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, on the Atlantic seaboard, with an aggregate population of nearly 900,000. (2) the Province of Quebec, on the St. Lawrence River, population nearly 1,300,000 (largely French), and the wealthy Province of Ontario with a population of nearly 2,000,000. (3) the Province of Manitoba in the central prairie region, population about 35,000. (4) the Province of British Columbia on the Pacific coast, population about 60,000. Outside these Provinces the scattered population is largely governed from Ottawa, which is the national capital.

The powers and relations of the different Provincial Legislatures and the Dominion Parliament are fixed by an act of the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain; and the Privy Council of Great Britain is the highest judicial Court to which appeals in reference to matters of legislation or administration can be referred. Such appeals are not, however, of frequent occurrence. Canada manages her own affairs. No imperial troops are stationed in the Dominion. The principal connecting link between the nation and the British Empire lies in the appointments to the Governor-Generalship of Canada, which are made by the British Crown. Roughly speaking, it may be said that the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction over all matters relating to commerce, national revenue, military and naval affairs, postal service and the government of extra-Provincial territory, while Provincial Legislatures have charge of matters relating to internal Provincial government, the police power necessary to enforce law and secure order and the control of legislation, creating municipalities and fixing and regulating their powers. Nearly all of the Dominion is divided into municipalities, varying in size and functions in the different Provinces, and exercising very extensive local powers.

Under its power to deal with questions affecting trade and commerce, the Dominion Parliament enacted, in 1878, a stringently-worded law of Local Option, by which the total Prohibition of the retail traffic in intoxicating beverages may be secured by any city or county in the Dominion. There is also a general law of total Prohibition for unorganized territory, subject, however, to a provision under which special permits to take liquor into this territory may be issued. National law also prohibits the sale of liquor to Indians and prohibits sale to any person on the days on which Parlimentary elections are held. The different Provinces enact laws for the licensing, controlling and regulating of the liquor traffic within their respective limits. About 35 years ago the Province of New Brunswick, then a Crown colony, enacted a law of Prohibition, which was repealed by the next Legislature before it had any opportunity to show its value or even to reveal its defects. Many years after, in the Legislature of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, which were at that time united, a proposed measure of Prohibition was defeated by the casting vote of the Speaker.

CANADIAN TEMPERANCE SENTIMENT.

The temperance question has always been in Canadian politics. Shortly after the discovery of the New World, when the northern part of this continent was under military government—established with the dual object of enlarging the possessions of France and spreading the doctrines of Christianity—a fierce conflict was waged between the ecclesiastical authorities who desired to prohibit the liquor traffic among the Indians and the military authorities who were in favor of permitting that traffic. Ever since that time, in some form or other, the country has been endeavoring to deal with the difficulties arising out of the inevitable contest between men willing to make money from their fellow beings' degradation and those opposed to a business so detrimental to the progress of true civilization.

When secret temperance organizations were first set on foot they found in Canada an inviting field which Washingtonian and Blue Ribbon movements had to some extent made ready for them. These societies still hold their own. There are Grand Lodges of the Independent Order of Good Templars, Grand Divisions of the Sons of Temperance and Woman's Christian Temperance Unions in every Province of the Dominion. The Royal Templars of Temperance are also very strong, and have lately been making remarkably rapid advances. Nearly all branches of the Christian church are sound on the question of temperance, and most of them have made emphatic utterances in favor of total Prohibition. In this connection the following recent deliverances, respectively, of the General Conference of the Methodist Church and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church may be taken as specimens:

Presbyterian General Assembly.

"This Assembly declares its conviction that the general traffic in intoxicating liquors is contrary to the word of God and to the spirit of the Christian religion; that total Prohibition would be the most effective form of temperance legislation, and that it is highly expedient that the State pass a Prohibitory law, and that this result is to be earnestly sought by all right means. This Assembly, with renewed earnestness and emphasis, again expresses the hope that the electors, in their choice of representatives, will elect only able and good men who are well known to be in sympathy with Prohibitory legislation."

Methodist General Conference.

"It gives us unbounded satisfaction to know that there is a great popular uprising all over the land against the great liquor crime. It stands between us and religious, social, moral and political reform. The ballot must execute the will of a free people, and must not be cast for that which is a sin against God and a crime against humanity. The time has come to draw the line between those who stand with the saloon and against the people, and those who stand with the people and against the saloon. We therefore recommend that our people, in all municipal and Parliamentary elections, vote only for candidates who, in addition to other necessary qualifications, are known and professed Prohibitionists, and we heartily pledge ourselves to co-operate with the Dominion Alliance and all temperance organizations in their efforts to educate the electors of the Dominion on the necessity of Prohibitory legislation. We cannot admit the statement so often made by those having little or no sympathy with Prohibition, that the country is not yet ready for a Prohibitory law; on the contrary, we are convinced that the country, by adopting the Scott act. showed it was ready for such legislation. We believe the wide growth of public sentiment in favor of Prohibition renders it the duty of our Parliament to pass a Prohibitory law that will brand the traffic with pubic condemnation."

THE DOMINION ALLIANCE.

Shortly after the federation of the different Provinces of Canada in one Dominion in the year 1866, an agitation was inaugurated looking toward a law of total Prohibition. Great petitions from every part of the country were piled up in the Dominion Parliament, and several Provincial Legislatures passed resolutions, all asking the national body for the enactment of such a law. A call for a Prohibitory Convention was issued by 16 members of the House of Commons in the year 1875. In response to the appeal, 280 representatives from the different Provinces assembled at Montreal. The meeting was presided over by Hon. Senator A. Vidal, and had the advice and assistance of Hon. Neal Dow of Portland, and John N. Stearns of New York, who were present as visitors. The conclusions of this Convention were summarized in the following resolutions:

"1. That the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors to be used as common beverages are found by the Parliamentary Committees, as well as the experience of society, to be a fruitful source of crime and pauperism, alike subversive of public morality and social order.

"2. That all attempts to restrict the traffic by license law are unsatisfactory, inasmuch as intemperance and all the evils connected therewith are constantly increasing.

"3 That nothing short of the entire Prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors as beverages would be satisfactory to this Convention.

"4. That in order that a Prohibitory liquor law, when passed, may have the sympathy and support so indispensably necessary to its success, it is the opinion of this Convention that the Dominion Parliament should be urged to frame such a law, subject to ratification by popular vote."

Out of this Convention grew an organization called "The Dominion Alliance for the Total Suppression of the Liquor Traffic," that is still the recognized representative body of the Prohibitionists of the Dominion of Canada. A branch of it was formed in every Province, and another for the Northwest Territories. The President of the Dominion Alliance is still Hon. A. Vidal of Sarnia, Ont., who has held that important position for 14 years and enjoys the respect and confidence of Prohibition workers of all classes and opinions. The Secretary is F. S. Spence of Toronto, Ont.

THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

The proposal of the Montreal Convention of 1875 did not find favor with the Dominion Parliament. Several committees were appointed from year to year to consider the question. A special Board of Commissioners was sent to investigate the Prohibitory laws in the United States. The result of the researches of these gentlemen was published in an extensive blue-book. A resolution was adopted by the House of Commons assenting to the principle of Prohibition. Finally, in 1878, there was enacted the Canada Temperance act, popularly known as the Scott act because it was introduced into Parliament by Hon. R. W. Scott, then Secretary of State. Its principal provisions may be summarized as follows:

The act is divided into three parts. The first part provides the machinery by which the second part may be adopted or rejected. The second part is the Prohibition part and does not come into force until it has been adopted by a vote of the electors. The third part provides for the enforcement of the law after its adoption. The following is a synopsis of the provisions of these respective parts:

Part I.

One-fourth of the electors in any city or county may petition the Governor-General in Council to have a vote taken upon the act in such city or county. The Governor-General in Council may then appoint a returning officer, fix a day for voting, and make all other needful arrangements for the polling of votes. Very severe penalties are provided for any corrupt practices. No treating of voters is allowed and all places where liquor is sold must be kept closed the whole of the day of voting. If a majority of the votes polled are in favor of the act, a proclamation will be issued bringing it into force; but in counties where licenses are in operation it cannot come into force before *at least* five months after the voting, nor until all licenses in force at the end of these five months have expired. If no licenses are in force in a county, the act may be brought into operation in that county after three months from the day of the voting adopting it. If the act be adopted it cannot be repealed for at least three years, nor until the repeal has been voted upon and adopted by the electors. If the act be rejected or repealed it cannot be again voted upon for three years.

Part II.

From the day of the coming into force of the act in any county or city, and as long as it remains in force, no intoxicating liquor shall be sold in any manner or under any pretext except in the cases hereinafter mentioned. Persons *who are specially licensed* may sell liquor by wholesale, but only in quantities of not less than ten gallons, or in case of ale or beer eight gallons, and only to licensed druggists, or other wholesalers, or to persons whom they have good reason to believe will carry it to and have it consumed in some place where the Scott act is not in force. Producers of native wine made from grapes grown by themselves may, when licensed, sell such wine to any person in quantities of not less than ten gallons, unless it be for medicinal or sacramental purposes, when they may sell as small a quantity as one gallon. Licensed druggists may sell in quantities of not less than one pint. Not more than one druggist may be licensed in a township, not more than two in a town, and not more than one for every 4,000 inhabitants in a city. Druggists are only allowed to sell liquor for medicinal or sacramental use, or for use in some *bona fide* art, trade or manufacture. Liquor can be sold for sacrament on a certificate signed by a clergyman; for medicine only on a certificate signed by a medical man, and for any other purpose only on a certificate signed by two Justices of the Peace. The licensed druggist must file all these certificates, must keep a full record of all the sales he makes and report the same to the Collector of Inland Revenue.

Part III.

The penalties for illegal sale are: For the first offense, a fine of not less than $50; for the second offense, a fine of not less than $100, and for the third and each subsequent offense, imprisonment for not more than two months. The clerk or agent who sells for another person shall be held guilty as well as his employer and shall be liable to the same punishment. All liquor and all vessels containing liquor in respect to which offenses have been committed shall be forfeited. Any person may be a prosecutor for a violation of the act. The Collector of Inland Revenue is required to prosecute when he has reason to believe that an offense has been committed. In a prosecution it is not necessary that a witness shall be able to state the kind or price of liquor unlawfully sold. It is enough to show that unlawful disposal of intoxicating liquor took place. The finding in any place of liquor, and also of appliances for its sale, is *prima facie* evidence of unlawful keeping for sale, unless the contrary is proved. The husband or wife of a person charged with an offense against the Scott act is a competent witness. Any person attempting to tamper with a witness in any prosecution under the act shall be liable to a fine of $50. Any person who is a party to an attempt to compromise or settle any offense against this act with a view of saving the violator from prosecution or conviction shall, on conviction, be imprisoned for not more than three months. No appeal shall be allowed against any conviction made by any Judge, Stipendiary or Police Magistrate, Sheriff, Recorder or Parish Court Commissioner.

THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT IN OPERATION.

Immediately after its enactment, the Canada Temperance act was taken hold of by temperance people, the city of Fredericton, the capital of New Brunswick, being the first place to vote. A large majority was recorded in favor of the law. Other cities and counties fell into line, and in a short time the greater part of the Maritime Provinces was placed under the act. Later on the Province of Ontario was brought to a great extent under the operation of this law, but unfortunately political complications interfered with its success. In Ontario all liquor laws are administered by local Boards of Commissioners appointed directly by the Provincial Government from year to year. This system necessarily makes the issuing of licenses to sell liquor a piece of party patronage and brings the liquor traffic actively and interestedly into Provincial politics. The enforcement of the law was defective and irregular. Where it was fairly and effectively carried out, the liquor traffic became arrayed against the party then in power. Where it was not properly enforced, friends of law and order were disgusted and offended. The liquor traffic took advantage of the opportunity, and when the question of repeal was submitted to the electors the active political workers who cared more for party than principle united, in 1887 and 1888, to defeat a measure that was an annoyance to them although a blessing to the community. The law was repealed in every place in Ontario in which it had been adopted. Some repeal movements were also successful in the Province of Quebec. The other Provinces of the Dominion not being affected by the considerations referred to, have stood loyally by the act; and in them it is accomplishing very much good. In the Province of Prince Edward Island the legalized retail liquor traffic is extinguished, the Canada Temperance act being in operation in every city and county.

The results of the adoption and enforcement of the act in the different parts of the Dominion have been very encouraging to the friends of moral reform. The consumption of strong drink has fallen off to a remarkable degree, and there has been an equally remarkable reduction in drunkenness and its attendant evils. The annual report of the Inspector of Prisons of the Province of Ontario for the year 1888 contains a tabulated list of the commitments to jail for drunkenness in all the counties of Ontario for 11 years. The figures for all the counties that were entirely under the Canada Temperance act in 1888 show, as compared with the figures for the year 1884 (the last year in which they were entirely under license), a falling off of 50 per cent. in commitments to jail for criminal drunkenness. It is startling to find at the same time that the figures for all the counties that were entirely under license for the two years named show an increase in 1888 as compared with 1884 of 25 per cent. in commitments to jail for drunkenness. Many similar official statements might be quoted to show the good that has resulted from the workings of this law.

THE LICENSE LAWS OF THE DIFFERENT PROVINCES.

The salient features of the different license laws in operation in the different parts of the Dominion are briefly given in the following summary:

Nova Scotia.

This Province has 19 counties and cities, in 11 of which the Scott act is now (Jan. 1. 1890) in operation. The license law affects only the remainder of the Province. This law provides for three classes of licenses: (1) A hotel license, permitting the sale of liquor in quantities of not over one quart. Sale may be made only to *bona fide* guests or lodgers to be used in rooms or at meals. If a hotel-keeper sells in any other way he is fined $100 for the first offense, and for a second, $100 and imprisonment for not more than two months. A person misrepresenting himself to be a guest is liable to a fine of $50. The fee for a hotel license is $150. (2) A shop license, fee $100, permitting sale in quantities of not less than a pint and not more than two gallons to be taken away for consumption. (3) A wholesale license, fee $150, permitting sale in quantities of not less than 12 gallons. Every sale, under any license, of more than one gallon, must be specially registered. The penalties for selling without license are $50 for first offence, $80 for second, $80 and imprisonment for third. Licenses are issued by the Municipal Councils. The Councils appoint Inspectors who are confirmed by the Government. Every Inspector must be a member of a temperance society in good standing at the time of his appointment and throughout his term of office. No license may be issued unless the applicant presents a petition signed by two-thirds of the ratepayers in his polling district. No sale of liquor is permitted between 9 P. M. and 7 A. M. Selling is also prohibited between 6 P. M. on Saturdays and 7 A. M. Mondays. No sale is allowed on any election day or to any person under 21 years of age or to any unlicensed person who intends to sell. Two Justices of the Peace may prohibit all dealers from selling to any particular person addicted to drunkenness. The husband, wife father, mother, child, master, curator, guardian or caretaker of any person addicted to drink, may prohibit any particular dealer from selling to such person. In case of a death through drink, the legal representatives of the deceased may recover damages up to $1,000 from the person who sold the liquor. Any one injured in person or property by a drunken person has recourse for damages against either the person who did the mischief or the person who sold the drink. Liquor in respect of which offences have been committed is forfeited and destroyed.

New Brunswick.

This Province has 16 counties and cities, of which nine are under the Scott act. In other parts of the Province two kinds of licenses are issued: (1) Tavern licenses, varying in prices at the option of the Municipal Council, from $25 to $200. This license permits sale in quantities not over a quart, to be drunk on the premises. (2) Wholesale licenses, fee varying from $50 to $200. This license permits sale in bulk not to be consumed on the premises, in quantities not less than one pint. Licenses are issued by the Municipal Council, which also appoints a License Inspector. The applicant for the license must have a petition signed by one-third the ratepayers in his district. The penalties for unlicensed selling are $50 for first offence, $80 for second, $80 and imprisonment for not more than three months with hard labor for third. The maximum number of licenses that can be issued in a municipality is limited in cities and towns to four for the first 1,000 of population and one to each 500 after. In rural places the maximum number is three to the first 1,200 of population and one to each 1,000 thereafter. The Municipal Councils may still further limit the number. No sale is allowed between 10 P. M. and 6 A. M. or between 7 P. M. on Saturday and 6 A M. on the following Monday. Prohibitions in relation to election days, minors and persons addicted to drink are the same as in Nova Scotia. The Civil Damage and liquor forfeiture provisions are the same as in Nova Scotia.

Prince Edward Island.

This Province, being entirely under the Scott act, has no license law in force in any part of it.

Quebec.

In this Province licenses are issued by the Collector of Provincial Revenue. They are of seven classes, namely: Licenses for (1) inns, (2) restaurants, (3) steamboat bars, (4) railway buffets, (5) taverns at mines, (6) retail liquor shops, and (7) wholesale liquor shops. Any person applying for a new license must present a petition signed by one-fourth of the voters in a rural municipality, or the ward of a city in which the license is to operate. If the number of voters is less than 50 the petition must be signed by a majority of them. Except in the cities of Quebec and Montreal the petition must also be ratified by the Municipal Council, and no license can be issued to any person who has permitted drunkenness on his premises, or has been twice fined for selling without a license. Fees range from $56.25 up to $512.50. Penalties for illicit selling range from $75 to $95 for a first offense, double that amount for a second offense, and for a third, not less than three months nor more than six months imprisonment. No liquor can be sold after 8 P. M. to soldiers, sailors or servants, or to any person between midnight and 5 A. M., or at all on Sundays, or to drunken persons, or persons under 21 years of age. A provision against selling to habitual drunkards is somewhat similar to that of Nova Scotia, with the addition that any one purchasing liquor for a habitual drunkard is liable to a fine of $50, or three months' imprisonment in default of payment of this fine. The law relating to Civil Damages is the same as that of Nova Scotia. Outside of cities, towns and villages no liquor may be sold within three miles of any public work under construction. There is also in the municipal law a Local Option provision by which any Municipal Council may entirely suppress the sale of liquor within its limits by a by-law either absolute or dependent upon popular vote for ratification.

Ontario.

In this Province licenses are issued and controlled by a board of three Commissioners and an Inspector, appointed by the Government, for each electoral division. There are three classes of licenses—tavern, shop and wholesale. The number of tavern licenses that may be issued is limited to four for the first 1,000 of the population in a municipality, and one to each subsequent 400. A Municipal Council may pass a by-law limiting the number below this maximum. For example, the city of Toronto, with a population of about 180,000, limits the number of tavern and saloon licenses to 150 An applicant for a license is required to secure endorsement by a majority of the voters in his electoral precinct, and thus license can issue only upon special appeal of the majority. Fees vary in different places and for different classes of licenses, the lowest possible fee being $90 and the highest $400. No liquor is sold from 7 o'clock Saturday night till 6 o'clock on Monday morning, or on election days. The purchaser of liquor sold illegally is liable to a fine not exceeding $10. A licensee who sells out of hours is fined for a first offense $40, for a second offense $80. and for a third offense $100, with an alternative of imprisonment. A third offense forfeits the license and the licensee is disqualified from obtaining another for two years. No liquor may be sold to any person under 18 years of age. The Civil Damage law is similar to that of Nova Scotia. Provisions prohibiting sale to intemperate persons are also similar to those of Nova Scotia. The penalties for illicit sale by persons unlicensed are for a first offense not more than $100 and costs, for a second, imprisonment for four months with hard labor, and for a third, imprisonment for six months with hard labor.

Manitoba.

Licenses in Manitoba are issued by a Board of Commissioners and Inspector, and are controlled as in Ontario. Outside a city or town with 2,000 population, each applicant for a license must present a petition signed by 14 out of the 20 householders nearest to his place of business. There are three classes of licenses as in other Provinces. The lowest possible fee is $100 and the highest $500. The statutory limit for the number of licenses is almost the same as in Ontario. No sale is allowed between 10 Saturday night and 7 Monday morning, or between 11.30 P. M. and 6 A. M. on other nights, or on election days, or to persons under 16. Penalties for selling out of hours are very heavy. Penalties for selling without licenses are, for first offense $50 to $250, for second offense $250 to $500, for third offense $500 to $1,000. Alternative imprisonments range from two months to two years. Provisions prohibiting sale to drunkards are similar to those of other provinces, with the addition that any two clergymen or two Justices of the Peace may prohibit any such sale, and any licensee who violates this provision is heavily punished and loses his license. Occupants of premises are responsible for any violation of the law that takes place in their houses. Civil Damages are recoverable up to $1,000 by legal representatives of any person who comes to his death through drunkenness. This Province has also a Local Option law of its own. Twenty-five per cent. of the voters of any municipality may demand a poll on the question of Prohibition. If two-thirds of the votes cast are in favor of the proposal, then license is abandoned. Under this provision four-fifths of the territory of Manitoba is now under Prohibition.

British Columbia.

The law in this Province is simple. The whole control of licenses is in the hands of the Municipal Council. Fees vary from $30 to $100 for each six months. A Board of Commissioners partly appointed and partly elective agrees to or refuses all applications. There is no limit to the number of licenses that may be issued. Two-thirds of the electors in a polling district must endorse an application for a new license. The penalty for illicit liquor-selling is a fine up to $250. besides the amount that should have been paid for a license. Outside these provisions selling is almost unlimited.

TOTAL PROHIBITION.

The general plan of work endorsed by the Dominion Alliance is that, while using every means to immediately restrict or prohibit the liquor traffic, nothing should be allowed to distract attention from progress towards the goal of total Prohibition. It is expected that this end will be attained by securing the election to the National Parliament of men who are known and avowed Prohibitionists, and who can be relied upon to support, regardless of party, a law for the entire legal suppression of the traffic in intoxicating beverages. To this end Prohibitionists are urged to use all their personal influence in their respective political caucuses to obtain the nomination of men who are sound on the Prohibition question. Only where these efforts fail to secure the nomination of a Prohibitionist by one of the existing parties, is an independent Prohibitionist to be nominated and supported. The Prohibitionist sentiment in the House of Commons is rapidly growing. A resolution was introduced into that body in 1884 declaring in favor of Prohibition. This resolution was amended so as to make it declare for Prohibition when public opinion should be pronouncedly in favor of it. A further amendment for immediate Prohibition was defeated by a vote of 55 to 107. The amended resolution in favor of Prohibition at some time was adopted by a vote of 122 to 40. Since then some electoral changes have taken place. Sentiment has been advancing. In 1889 the question of immediate Prohibition was defeated by a vote of 59 to 99, and the resolution in favor of Prohibition at some time was adopted by a unanimous vote. The Alliance, on this line, hopes to ultimately secure the object it has in view.

POLITICAL ACTION.

The plan on which Canadian Prohibitionists in general are working has been outlined. Their principles and methods are laid down in the following, which is the platform of the Alliance:

"1. That it is of the highest importance to obtain united political action on the part of all those who are in favor of the immediate total Prohibition of the liquor traffic.

"2. That we endorse the action of our friends in the House of Commons, in introducing and supporting the Prohibition resolution of 1887, and we request them to take like action at every session of Parliament until the resolution be adopted and Prohibition secured.

"3. That we call upon the friends of Prohibition to organize in each of the constituencies for the purpose of preventing the re-election of any member who does not favor such a resolution, and for securing the nomination and election of candidates who are known and publicly avowed Prohibitionists.

"4. That where the nomination of such a Prohibition candidate is not otherwise secured, an independent Prohibition candidate be nominated and supported at the polls."

This action, however, does not meet the approval of all Canadian temperance workers. Some are of the opinion that Prohibition obtained on the lines proposed would not be sufficiently effective. They believe that the only hope for success lies in Prohibition secured through an independent political party. In the Maritime Provinces a Prohibition party has been formed and has taken part in several contests, polling in some cases a not inconsiderable vote. The head of this movement is J. T. Bulmer of Halifax, editor of the *Canadian Voice*, the organ of the party named. In the Province of Ontario there is also an organization known as "Canada's New Party," which is definitely committed to total Prohibition. The leader of the movement and President of the organization is Rev. A. Sutherland, D. D., of Toronto. The party is not solely a Prohibition party. Its platform contains the following planks:

"1. Righteousness and truth in public affairs as well as in private business, and no compromise with wrong.

"2. Equal rights for all creeds, classes and nationalities, but exclusive privileges to none.

"3. A national sentiment, a national literature and in all matters of public policy, our country first.

"4. The prompt and absolute Prohibition of the liquor traffic, and the honest and vigorous enforcement of all laws for the repression of vice and intemperance.

"5. Retrenchment and economy in public expenditure, with the view of reducing our enormous national debt.

"6. Manhood suffrage with an educational qualification—that is, a vote to every freeman of legal age who can read and write.

"7. The extension of the franchise to women.

"8. An elective Senate.

"9. Civil Service Reform."

CONSUMPTION OF LIQUOR.

From what has been said it will be seen at once that Canada is largely a Prohibition country. The consumption of liquor has been steadily decreasing (notwithstanding the increase in population) as laws have been increased in stringency and Prohibitory territory has increased in area. (See CONSUMPTION OF LIQUORS.) Taking our different Provinces all the the way through, the amount of drink consumed is proportionate to the extent of territory that is under Prohibition, going gradually from British Columbia, in which the Scott act has not yet been tried and where license laws are extremely lax, down to Prince Edward Island, where the Scott act is in operation over the whole Province. British Columbia's consumption is over eight gallons per head; Prince Edward Island's consumption is less than three-fourths of a gallon. The following table, showing the per capita consumption for the year 1888, will make the point very clear:

Gallons of Liquor consumed per capita in different Provinces in 1888.

British Columbia	8¾
Ontario	5½
Quebec	3¾
Manitoba and Northwest Territory	2
New Brunswick	1½
Nova Scotia	1¼
Prince Edward Island (less than)	¾
Dominion of Canada . (less than)	4

During the year (1888) the Scott act was not in operation in any part of British Columbia. It was in force in about 20 cities and counties in Ontario, not including, however, any large cities. A large portion of Quebec was under local

Prohibition. A large portion of Manitoba was under Prohibition through Provincial Local Option; all the Northwest Territories were, however, under Prohibition. The Scott act was the law in 10 out of New Brunswick's 18 counties and cities. In Nova Scotia it was in force in 12 out of 19 counties and cities. It was in operation over the whole Province of Prince Edward Island.

LAW ENFORCEMENT.

It is worth while noting that, generally speaking, the liquor law in Canada is well enforced. The difficulties that are met with everywhere in dealing with the liquor traffic exist here, but the traffic is not so openly defiant and is more under control than in most other countries. Persons holding retail liquor licenses are prohibited from occupying seats in any Municipal Council. Law and Order Leagues exist and do a good work in the large cities where the traffic is best organized and most aggressive. Public sentiment is decidedly against liquor-selling, and the whole business is disreputable. This healthy sentiment is growing and laws are becoming more and more stringent and better enforced. At the present time there are in several Provinces efforts being made for further legislation of an even stronger character, and Canada actually presents the probably unique spectacle of a steadily diminishing liquor power and a steadily popular progress, on actually effective lines, towards general sobriety and total Prohibition.

F. S. SPENCE.
(Formerly editor of the *Canada Citizen.*)

Candidates.—See PROHIBITION PARTY.

Carson, Thomas L.—Born in Salem, N. Y., March 3, 1807, and died in Syracuse, N. Y., Nov. 21, 1868. While still a boy he removed with his parents to the town of Elbridge, N. Y. Here he lived during the greater part of his life. He early became an earnest worker in the temperance cause. Under the Local Option law of 1846 many towns in New York State voted for "no license;" but numbers of liquor-dealers continued to sell in violation of law. Mr. Carson conceived a plan of organization for the punishment of these offenders and the complete suppression of their unlawful business. The Carson League was established, composed of persons committed in writing to the enforcement of anti-liquor laws and pledged to the payment of the necessary funds to procure counsel and obtain evidence against the law-breakers. Whenever money was needed a *pro rata* assessment was made upon the League members. This organization spread into many sections of New York and extended into other States. A newspaper, the *Carson League*, was established by Mr. Carson at Syracuse about the year 1853, in support of the enforcement movement and in opposition to the legalized drink traffic as well. By means of this paper Mr. Carson did much toward securing the nomination and election of Myron H. Clark as Governor of New York in 1854, and the consequent enactment of the Prohibitory law of 1855. After this apparent triumph of Prohibition he removed with his paper to New York City, but there it was discontinued and he returned to Elbridge. The Court of Appeals found a flaw in the Maine law, as the Prohibitory statute of New York was called, and instead of amending the measure the Legislature in 1857 repealed it and passed a license law. Mr. Carson immediately renewed the war on the drink traffic, employing much the same tactics as were used in the organization of the Carson League. The new society was known as the State League, and a new paper, the *State League*, was started to support it. Each Leaguer pledged at least $1 a year in payment for the paper, and also agreed not to use or sell intoxicating drinks, or vote for any but enemies of the liquor traffic to fill offices that had to do with the enactment or enforcement of liquor laws. This paper he continued to publish until his death. He was a philanthropist and a brave, energetic and self-denying worker, and he died in the midst of his labors against the legalized and defiant liquor traffic. He believed that in order to destroy the business law must be brought to bear against it. One of his sayings was that "the best temperance tracts he knew of were rumsellers' tracks to jail." With this conviction, on one occasion he secured the prosecution of his own brother (with whom he was on friendly terms) for keeping a hotel with a bar in violation of law.

Catholic Temperance Societies.—On Washington's Birthday, Feb. 22, 1872, the Catholic Total Abstinence Union was formed in the city of Baltimore, Md. It was organized for the purpose of assisting to stem the tide of intemperance; and following in the footsteps of the glorious apostle of total abstinence, Theobald Mathew, his plan of individual pledges was adopted.

The objects of the Union are as follows: 1. To secure to its members the privilege of being received into societies connected with the Union in any part of America. 2. To encourage and aid committees and pastors to establish new societies. 3. To spread, by means of Catholic total abstinence publications, correct views regarding total abstinence principles.

The constitution states that to accomplish these objects we rely upon: 1. The practice of our holy religion by all members, individually. 2. The observance by our members of the maxims laid down for our guidance by the reverend clergy. 3. The influence of good example and kind persuasion by our members upon our fellow-Catholics. 4. Our connection with the association of prayer in honor of the sacred thirst and agony of Jesus. 5. The appointment of a lecture and publication bureau.

The pledge of the Union is as follows:

> "I promise, with the Divine assistance and in honor of the sacred thirst and agony of our Saviour, to abstain from all intoxicating drinks; to prevent as much as possible, by advice and example, the sin of intemperance in others; and to discountenance the drinking customs of society."

The officers of the Union are a Spiritual Director, President, 1st and 2d Vice-Presidents, Treasurer and Secretary. While the Total Abstinence Union is the principal temperance organization of the Roman Catholic Church, there are various subordinate and dependent societies in States and dioceses where the Union has not been regularly formed. All those have been approved by the Plenary Council of the Church in America; and the Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII, has formally commended and blessed the work in which the various total abstinence societies of the church are engaged. (See ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.)

With these approvals of our spiritual fathers the Union has achieved much success. It is earnestly working to have a total abstinence society in every parish; and as a means toward this end, it has provided that the 1st Vice-President shall appoint an organizer for each diocese. The system is now being tried, and good results are hoped for. Special efforts are being made to form cadet organizations in order to bring up the youth free from the cravings of appetite. Many societies of women have been formed for the purpose of cultivating the home influence so necessary for the successful continuance of our labors.

The Union has sent out lecturers to all sections of the country, and has disseminated a large number of total abstinence documents—especially the lectures of Most Rev. Archbishop Ireland and the pamphlets of Rev. Dr. T. J. Conaty. Thus the work of the Union is being carried on from Maine to California and from Minnesota to Texas. Our people are advised to shun the flowing bowl and seek safety for home and family under the banner of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union. The enrolled membership in good standing is now about 56,000.

PHILIP A. NOLAN,
General Secretary Catholic Total Abstinence Union.

Cause and Consequence.—The origin of the stimulant habit is lost in the cloudland of prehistoric tradition, but the antiquity of the vice does not warrant the belief in the physiological necessity of its practice. The undoubted fact that there have been manful, industrious and intelligent nations of total abstainers would be an almost sufficient refutation of that inference, which is sometimes qualified by the assertion that the vicissitudes of a rigorous climate have to be counteracted by the stimulus of alcoholic beverages. For it can, besides, be proved that the alleged invigorating action of alcohol is an absolute delusion, and the pathological records of contemporary nations establish the fact that the epidemic increase of intemperance can nearly always be traced to causes wholly independent of any increased demands upon the physical or intellectual energies of the afflicted community. Those energies, in fact, have lamentably decreased among numerous races that once managed to combine nature-abiding habits with an abundance of vital vigor.

The inevitable progressiveness of all stimulant habits (see POISONS) is an additional argument in favor of the theory that the poison vice has grown up from very small beginnings, and the genesis of the fatal germ has probably been supplied in the hypothesis of Tabio Colonna, an Italian physician of the 17th Century. "Before people used wine," says he, "they drank sweet must, and preserved it, like oil, in jars or skins. But in a warm climate a saccharine fluid is apt to ferment, and some avaricious housekeeper may have drunk that spoiled liquid till she became fond of it, and learned to prefer it to must." Avarice, aided perhaps by dietetic prurience or indifference to the warnings of instinct, planted the baneful seed, and the laws of evolution did the rest.

As soon as the sale of intoxicating liquors had become extensive enough to be profitable, the managers of the traffic had a personal interest in disseminating the poison habit. Attempts at reform were met by appeals to the convivial instincts of the stimulant dupes, by the seduction of minors and by charges of asceticism; later by nostrum puffs and opium wars. More than 2,000 years ago the worship of Bacchus was propagated by force of arms. The disciples of Ibn Hanbal, the Arabian Father Mathew, were stoned in the streets of Bagdad. The persecution and repeated expulsion of the Grecian Pythagoreans had a good deal to do with the temperance teachings of their master. In Palestine, in India, in mediæval Europe every apostle of nature had to contend with a rancorous opposition, often inspired by motives of sordid self-interest; and our own age in that respect cannot boast of much improvement. In spite of our higher standards of philanthropy and their numerous victories in other directions, the heartless alliance of Bacchus and mammon still stands defiant. In our own country nearly 200,000 men, not half of them entitled to plead the excuses of ignorance or poverty, unblushingly invoke the protection of the law in behalf of a traffic involving the systematic propagation of disease, misery and crime. Wherever the interests of the poison vendors are at stake, the nations of Europe have not made much progress since the time when the sumptuary laws of Leo de Medici were defeated by street riots and a shrieking procession of the Florentine tavern-keepers.

The efforts of such agitators are seconded by the instinct of imitation. "In large cities," says Dr. Schrodt, "one may see gamins of nine or ten grubbing in rubbish-heaps for cigar-stumps; soon after leaning against a board fence, groaning and shuddering, as they pay the repeated penalties of nature, yet all the same repeating the experiment with the resignation of martyrs. The rich, the fashionable do it; those whom they envy smoke; smoking, they conclude, must be something enviable." Without any intentional arts of persuasion, the Chinese business men of San Francisco have disseminated a new poison vice by smoking poppy-gum in the presence of their Caucasian employees and accustoming them to associate the sight of an opium debauch with the idea of enjoyment and recreation. Would the opponents of Prohibition attempt to deny that analogous influences (the custom of "treating" friends at a public bar, the spectacle of lager beer orgies in public gardens, etc.) have a great deal to do with the initiation of boy-topers?

Ignorance does not lead our dumb fellow-creatures to vicious habits, and prejudice is therefore, perhaps, the more correct name for the sad infatuation which prompts so many millions of our young men to defy the protests of instinct and make themselves the slaves of a life-destroying poison. Ignorance is nescience. Prejudice is *malscience*, miscreance, trust in erroneous teachings. Millions of children are brought up in the belief that health can be secured only by abnormal means. A pampered child complains of headache, of want of appetite. Instead of curing the evil by the removal of the cause, in the way so plainly indicated by the monitions of instinct, the mother sends to the drug-store. The child must "take something." A young rake, getting more fretful and dyspeptic from year to year, is advised to "try something"—an aloe-pill, a bottle of medicated brandy, any quack "specific" recommended by its bitterness or nauseousness. The protests of nature are calmly disregarded in such cases. A dose of medicine, according to popular impression, cannot be very effective unless it is very repulsive. Our children thus learn to mistrust the voice of their natural instincts. They try to rely on the aid of abnormal agencies instead of trusting their troubles to nature. Boys whose petty ailments have been palliated with stimulants will afterwards be tempted to drown thir sorrows in draughts of the same nepenthe, instead of biding their time, like Henry Thoreau, who preferred to "face any fate rather than seek refuge in the mist of intoxication."

We have seen that the milder stimulants often form the stepping-stones to a passion for stronger poisons. A *penchant* for any kind of tonic drug, nicotine, narcotic infusions, the milder opiates, etc., may thus initiate a stimulant habit with an unlimited capacity for development, and there is no doubt that international traffic has relaxed the vigilance which helped our forefathers to guard their homes against the introduction of foreign poison vices. Hence the curious fact that drunkenness is most prevalent, not in the most ignorant or despotic countries (Spain, Russia, Turkey), nor in regions where alcoholic drinks of the most seductive kind are cheapest, but in the most commercial countries--western France, Great Britain, Holland and North America. Hence also the fallacy of the brewers' argument that the use of lager beer would prevent the dissemination of the opium habit. No stimulant vice has ever prevented the introduction of worse poisons. Among the indirect causes of intemperance we must therefore include our mistaken toleration of the minor stimulants, and of the traffic in "medicated" quack brandies.

Alcohol in the course of the last 2,000 years has proved a direr enemy to the welfare of the human race than war, pestilence and the rage of all the hostile elements of nature taken together. Unquestionable statistics demonstrate the fact that the total loss of life (by shortening the average of human longevity) caused by strong drink equals the havoc of perennial warfare. The loss of health more than equals the consequences of malaria in the most unhealthy regions of the globe. The waste of land can be estimated only by millions of square miles, devoted to the production of food-stuffs to be devoured by breweries and distilleries. The loss of labor diverts from useful or harmless pursuit the energies of some thirty to forty millions of our fellow men. The moral loss is not confined to the direct influence of the brutalizing poison. The liquor traffic defiles all participants of a transaction which involves a sin against nature, a crime against society and posterity, and an outrage against the moral instincts of all unprejudiced human beings.

FELIX L. OSWALD.

Central America.—The hereditary abstemiousness of the Spanish people of Mexico and Central America has been somewhat modified by the influence of foreign manners, but, on the other hand, that evil tendency has been checked by the lesson of practical experience in the intertropical seaport towns where the alcoholized foreigners succumb by hundreds to epidemics that spare the temperate natives. The history of fever and epidemics on the Isthmus of Panama has for centuries confirmed the verdict of Dr. H. E. Ward, who passed many years on the deadly swamp-coasts of the Sunda Islands. "I have had the opportunity," he says, "of observing for 20 years the comparative use of coffee in one class of natives and of spirituous liquors in another—the native Sumatrans using the former and the natives of British India, settled here, the other; and I find that while the former expose themselves with impunity to every degree of heat, cold and wet, the latter can endure neither for even a short period without danger to their health." The intelligent natives of the Central American seaport towns regard the rumshops of the foreign residents very much as the Caucasians of San Francisco regard the "opium hells" of their Chinese fellow-citizens, and in extensive districts of the interior alcohol is used only in the form of pulque, the fermented juice of the aloe plant. Occasional excesses in the use of that beverage are not wholly confined to the *ladinos*—the Spanish-Indian country population,—but habitual intemperance is very rare among the educated classes.

FELIX L. OSWALD.

Chambers, John.—Born in Stewartstown, County Tyrone, Ireland, Dec. 19, 1797, and died Sept. 22, 1875. His father, William Chambers, was involved in Irish revolutionary enterprises, and fled with his wife and infant son John to America. The refugee settled on an Ohio farm. The boy at the age of 16 entered the store of a cousin in Baltimore. At 17 he united with the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church. Deciding to become a minister he spent five years in a school in Baltimore. In 1825 he was appointed pastor of the 1st Independent Church of Philadelphia. He was gifted with exceptional oratorical powers, and it was not long before he began to use his talents to arouse public sentiment against the indulgence in intoxicating beverages. He presided over the first public temperance meeting held in Philadelphia, and in 1840 organized among the young men of his congregation a Youths' Temperance Society by means of which many temperance workers received their early training. In 1849 he was introduced to an audience as "the war-horse of the temperance cause," and ever after he was known as "The War Horse." In the early days of his ministry it was the common custom to serve liquors at funerals. Mr. Chambers gave notice from his pulpit that he would enter no house where liquors were provided, and on one occasion he stood outside in a drenching rain and refused to officiate until the corpse had been brought to him. Throughout his long ministry he continued the work, seeking by sermons, by addresses, by prayers, by pledge-taking, by pecuniary contributions for the aid of reformed inebriates, by training young men and by all other available methods to promote the temperance reform. His efforts made bitter enemies for him among the liquor-dealers. Once he was confronted on the street by a rumseller, who seizing him by the collar, heaped profanity and abuse upon him. Mr. Chambers listened quietly until his assailant was out of breath and then politely lifted his hat, thanked him and went on his way. He was especially successful with young men. About two score of the young men of his congregation became clergymen, and a company of thirty youths of his church, headed by John Wanamaker (afterwards Postmaster-General), founded the widely-known Bethany Sunday-school of Philadelphia. In the half century of his Christian ministry he admitted 3,585 members to his church.

Champagne.—See VINOUS LIQUORS.

Channing, William Ellery, an eminent American clergyman, reformer and writer, born in Newport, R. I., April 7, 1780, and died in Bennington, Vt., Oct. 2, 1842. At the age of 12 he was sent to New London, Conn., to prepare for college, and two years later, in 1794, he entered the Freshman class at Harvard. He graduated from the institution in 1798 and spent the following 18 months as tutor in a private family at Richmond, Va. In 1800 he returned to Newport and continued his studies, dividing his time between the public library and the sea-shore. In 1801 he removed to Cambridge, Mass., and being elected Regent of the University entered upon the study of theology. He received approbation to preach in 1802, and his sermons attracted immediate attention for their fervor and solemnity. He was ordained pastor of the Federal Street Church of Boston, June 1, 1803. In the disagreement between the "liberal" and "orthodox" Congregationalists of New England, Dr. Channing was the recognized leader of the "liberals," since known as Unitarians. Soon after his marriage in 1814 he began the study of the German philosophers, Kant, Schelling and Fichte. After Napoleon's overthrow at Waterloo he preached a sermon on the "goodness of God in delivering the Christian world from military discipline." In 1822 he visited Europe, and upon his return to this country in 1824 the appointment of Rev. Ezra Gannett as his colleague in pastoral work permitted him to devote much more of his time to literature and social reforms. He lectured and preached sermons against slavery and in behalf of temperance, education and prison reform. His best-known effort in advocacy of temperance was his "Address on Temperance," delivered in Boston, Feb. 28, 1837. In this he took radical ground on the question of total abstinence. "It is very plain," said he, "too plain to be insisted on, that to remove what intoxicates is to remove intoxication. In proportion as ardent spirits are banished from our houses, our tables, our hospitalities, in proportion as those who have influence and authority in the community abstain themselves and lead their dependents to abstain from their use, in that proportion the occasions of excess must be diminished, the temptations to it must disappear." But while convinced that the liquor traffic ought to be prohibited, Dr. Channing was doubtful whether public opinion at that time (1837) was sufficiently aroused to successfully enforce Prohibitory statutes. This is manifest in the same address: "What ought not to be used as a beverage ought not to be sold as such. What the good of the community requires us to expel no man has a moral right to supply. That intemperance is dreadfully multiplied by the number of licensed shops for the retailing of spirits we all know. That these should be shut every good man desires. Law, however, cannot shut them except to a limited extent, or only in a few favored parts of the country. Law is here the will of the people, and the Legislature can do little unless sustained by the public voice. To form, then, an enlightened and vigorous public sentiment, which will demand the suppression of these licensed nurseries of intemperance, is a duty to which every good man is bound and a service in which each may take a share." His nephew and biographer, Rev. William H. Channing, says of his attitude on the temperance question ("Memoirs of William Ellery Channing," vol. 3, p. 30):

> "With his habitual love of individual freedom and his excessive dread of the tyranny incident to associated action, he refrained, indeed, from joining the temperance societies and never adopted or advised others to adopt their pledges. But by precept and example he lent the full weight of his influence to the temperance reform."

In 1833 Dr. Channing himself wrote: "The temperance reform which is going on among us deserves all praise, and I see not what is to hinder its complete success. . . . I believe the movements now made will succeed because they are in harmony with and seconded by the general spirit and progress of the age." ("Memoirs," vol. 3, p. 36.)

Chickering, John White.—Born in Woburn, Mass., March 19, 1808, and died in Brooklyn, N. Y., Dec. 9, 1888. He came from an old New England family, and was the fourth in a line of Congregational ministers. He graduated from Middlebury College in 1826, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1829. In 1830 he was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church at Bolton, Mass., and after a nine years' pastorate accepted a call to the High Street Congregational Church of Portland, Me., where he remained for 30 years. Dr. Chickering was a contributor to various newspapers, and published two books, "The Hill-Side Church" and "Sermons on the Decalogue." He wrote a number of tracts on temperance and gospel subjects, and some of them have been translated into other languages and widely circulated. He also preached often from the pulpit on the temperance question, advocating total abstinence for the individual and Prohibition of the liquor traffic by the State.

China.[1]—Intoxicating drinks have been used in China from the remotest times. The earliest historical records, which begin at a period more than 2,000 years before the Christian era, mention a spirituous liquor as an article already in common use and speak of the drunkenness of some of the early Emperors and their ministers as a matter of shame and a source of calamity. The art of distillation, in all probability, was first discovered by the Chinese, but at such an early date that there is no record of it. One tradition ascribes its invention to Tu K'ang, who, Dr. Williams says, was a woman of the Scythian tribes. Dr. Legge, however, says it is not known who Tu K'ang was. Another Chinese tradition declares that this liquor was first made by (Iti, probably) a cook in the household of Yü, who reigned in the 23d Century before Christ. Dr. Edkins has denied that distillation was known among the Chinese before 1280 A. D., and would have us believe that this early liquor was simply fermented. But Dr. Legge has shown that the phrase for distilled liquor, on which this argument turns, was used at least as early as 618 A. D. At any rate there has been no such thing as native beer made in modern times. Grapes are grown in many places, but no wine is manufactured. All Chinese liquors to-day are distilled.

---

[1] The editor is indebted to Rev. E. T. Williams (Nankin, China), Rev. C. Hartwell (formerly of Foochow, China), Rev. T. Laurie (Providence, R. I.), and Rev. S. L. Baldwin (Recording Secretary, Mission Rooms of the Methodist Episcopal Church, New York).

ANCIENT TESTIMONY.

Whatever opinion as to the period of the discovery of distillation is accepted, it is certain that alcoholic liquors, however prepared, were in use among the Chinese in the most distant ages. The literature of the nation abounds in testimonies concerning the evils wrought by intemperance, impressive utterances against indulgence and Imperial decrees of a restrictive or Prohibitory nature. Mencius has told us of Yü the Great, the founder of the Hia Dynasty (2205 B. C.): "Yü hated the pleasant wine" (Legge, "Chinese Classics," vol. 2, p. 202). The common Chinese explanation of this is also given by Legge in a quotation from "The Plans of the Warring States," a history of the times next succeeding Confucius: "Eteih (or Iti) made wine which Yü tasted and liked, but he said, 'In after ages there will be those who through wine will lose their kingdoms'; so he degraded Eteih and refused to drink pleasant wine." It should be noticed here that Legge, like many other writers, uses the term "wine" for fermented liquors made from millet, rice or any kind of grain.

And Yü's prediction was too sadly fulfilled. The dynasty he founded came to an end in B. C. 1766, through the overthrow of Kieh, the abandoned tyrant, who to gratify his favorite concubine lavished treasures "in providing her with a splendid palace, and in the park that surrounded it a lake of wine was formed at which 'three thousand men drank at the sound of a drum,' while the trees hung with dried meats, and 'hills of flesh' were piled up." (Mayers's Manual, p. 82.) He was followed by Tang the Completer who overcame him and founded the Shang dynasty. But this dynasty came to an end in 1122, by the suicide of Chow Sin, an even more abandoned and cruel tyrant than Kieh if possible, with whom he is classed by the Chinese as one of the "two wicked Emperors." The book of "Shu King" reports the words of the Count of Wei in 1123 B. C., when lamenting the impending fall of the Shang dynasty. "The House of Yin," said Wei, "we may conclude can no longer exercise rule over the four quarters of the kingdom. The great deeds of our founder were displayed in former ages, but by our maddened indulgence in spirits we have destroyed the effects of his virtues in these after times." (Legge's translation.) And Wu Wang, who overthrew Chow Sin, in a "Great Declaration" to the princes, officers and people, declared respecting the fallen monarch that "He has been abandoned to drunkenness and reckless in lust."

But the dissolute royal example had led to a sad state of morals among the people both high and low, and when Wu Wang appointed his brother Fung to rule over the region around the former capital, in the present Province of Honan, he addressed to him the "Announcement about Fermented Liquors" found in Book X of the "Shu King." This remarkable "Announcement" antedates the admonitions of Solomon in the Book of Proverbs, and is probably the oldest temperance discourse on record. It is, in part, as follows:

> "When your reverend father, King Wan, founded our kingdom in the western region, he delivered announcements and cautions to the princes of the various states, their officers, assistants and managers of affairs, morning and evening, saying, 'For sacrifices spirits should be employed. When Heaven was sending down its favoring commands and laying the foundations of our people's sway, spirits were used only in the great sacrifices. But when Heaven has sent down its terrors, and our people have been thereby greatly disorganized and lost their sense of virtue, this too can be ascribed to nothing else than their unlimited use of spirits; yea, further, the ruin of the feudal states, small and great, may be traced to this one sin, the free use of spirits.' King Wan admonished and instructed the young and those in office managing public affairs that they should not habitually drink spirits. In all the states he enjoined that their use be confined to times of sacrifices; and even then with such limitations that virtue should prevent drunkenness."

Continuing, Wu Wang establishes severe Prohibitory rules, as follows:

> "If you are told that there are companies who drink together, do not fail to apprehend them all and send them to Chow, where I may put them to death. As to the ministers and officers of Yin [another term for the Shang dynasty], who have been led to it and been addicted to drink, it is not necessary to put them to death; let them be taught for a time. If they keep my lessons I will give them bright distinction. If you disregard my lessons, then I, the one man, will show you no pity. As you cannot cleanse your way, you shall be classed with those who are to be put to death. The king says, O Fung, give constant heed to my admonitions. If you do not manage right your officers, the people will continue lost in drink."

Afterwards other expedients were tried to prevent intemperance. About Wu

Wang's time elaborate ceremonies in connection with drinking were prescribed. Etiquette required that host and guest should bow to each other so many times before each drinking that if they drank together all day "they could not get drunk." Near the beginning of the Han dynasty (B. C. 206) and afterwards, a fine of four ounces of silver was put on all guilty of meeting together and drinking in companies of more than three persons. In B. C. 98 liquors could be made and sold only by the Government. An Emperor of the Northern Wei dynasty, A. D. 459, made a very severe Prohibitory law. All liquor-makers, liquor-vendors and liquor-drinkers were to be beheaded. In 781 an Emperor of the T'ang dynasty invented a peculiar scheme of Prohibition. All the liquor-shops were divided into three grades, to pay a monthly tax to the Government according to size, and then all persons, officers and people were strictly forbidden to buy or drink. In the Kin Tartar dynasty, 1160, the law was that all officials who drank should be beheaded. In 1279 the Mongol Emperor had a law that all liquor-makers should be banished and enslaved, and all their property and children should come under the control and care of the Government. During the present dynasty no laws have been made respecting the use of liquors or spirits.[1]

A common Chinese saying has been rendered into English thus:

"First the man takes a dram,
Then the dram takes a dram,
Then the drams take the man."

PRESENT DRINK CONDITIONS.

As has already been stated, the Chinese do not now manufacture fermented liquors, and have not done so in recent times. Moreover their distilled beverages are not frequently consumed to excess, and it is probably true that so far as the use of alcoholic beverages is concerned China is the most temperate of the great nations of the world. "In an observation of over 20 years in China," writes a former American missionary,[2] "I did not see a Chinaman intoxicated more than once or twice, except where I had reason to know that he was intoxicated on foreign liquor." The most common distilled beverage made by the Chinese is a species of arrack, prepared from glutinous rice. The law forbids the use of the "sien" or ordinary rice for this purpose, as it is the people's main dependence for food. Wheat, barley, millet and Indian corn are also distilled. Next to rice the "kao-liang" or millet is most frequently used and makes a strong liquor, although none of the Chinese intoxicants are as strong in alcohol as those of Western nations. Thrice-distilled liquor is called "samshu." Chinese arrack contains perhaps two-thirds as much alcohol as American whiskies. Among the reasons assigned for the comparative freedom of the people from drunkenness are: 1. The fact that their diet is light and simple, and does not tend to awaken the appetite for strong drink that goes along with higher living; 2. The general use of tea, which quenches thirst and to a large extent takes the place of liquor; 3. The great prevalence of the opium habit, taking the place of the alcohol vice with the victims of that habit. There is nothing in China corresponding to the saloon of Western countries. The ordinary place of resort is the tea-house, and all affairs are discussed over "the cup that cheers but not inebriates." There is of course a certain amount of drinking at the inns and restaurants. There are no shops given entirely to the sale and drinking of liquors. There may be more drunkenness, however, than is apparent, for the very reason that drinking is almost wholly confined to the home, where its results are not easily observed by strangers. It is impossible to ascertain the exact amount of liquor of native production consumed in China. In 1888 there were 198,623 piculs of samshu, valued at 552,442 taels, exported from the "open" ports. (A picul is equal to 133⅓ lbs. and a tael to $1.15.) This, however, can represent only a small portion of the total manufacture. Dr. J. G. Kerr, a medical missionary at Canton, estimates the proportion of adults—men and women—addicted to drinking at 60 per cent. At an average daily allowance of four Chinese ounces the expense for each person per annum would amount to 2.25 taels, or $2.59, if the cheapest liquor is purchased. This is certainly a very moderate estimate. There are very few Chinamen who do not occasionally drink, for social usage requires it on certain occasions, such as the birth of a son, a wedding, funeral or birthday celebration. It is safe to say there are 150,000,000 adults in China. According to the above estimate the annual consumption will approximate 1,350,000,000 gallons, at a cost of more than $233,000,000.

---

[1] These various items have been taken from Dr. Faber's work in Chinese, entitled "Civilization, Chinese and Christian."

[2] Rev. S. L. Baldwin, New York.

But a change for the worse is gradually being effected, and for this change the foreigners, men professing the Christian religion, are responsible. Until recently there was no market in China for foreign liquors. Those shipped to her ports were admitted free of duty because consumed by foreigners alone. Not long since, however (1888), foreign wine, beer and spirits were put upon the tariff list because, as was asserted, the Chinese were already purchasing them in considerable quantities. This consumption is increasing rapidly, especially or almost wholly among the official and moneyed classes; for at present their use is limited by the high prices demanded for them. In the "Returns of Trade" for 1888, published by the customs service, the quantities of wines and spirits entered are given for only nine of the 29 open ports. These quantities had an aggregate value of 331,936 taels ($381,726.40). Dr. J. G. Kerr, in the article referred to above (*Chinese Recorder*, January, 1888), says:

> "The advent of foreigners to China brought with it a terrible evil in the use of opium, and this is wasting the lives and substance of tens of thousands of her people and rendering the salvation of their souls almost an impossibility. The future threatens an evil many fold greater than opium, as a concomitant of the introduction of Western science and education. The use of native liquors is limited because of the character given them by the crude mode of manufacture. The consumption of foreign liquors is limited because of their expense. The time will no doubt soon come when alcoholic drinks will be prepared here as they are in the West and as cheaply as native spirits now are. The probability is that their use will increase and drunkenness will become as common as it is in so-called Christian lands and the evils following in its train be as great here as they are there."

That this danger is not imaginary he proceeds to show by quoting reliable statements as to the effects already realized in the neighboring Empire of Japan, where the conditions a few years ago were as they are now in China. There is no regulation by the Chinese Government of the traffic in intoxicating liquors beyond the collection of a local tax on the production, and the import and export dues. The attention of the missionaries in some places is being directed to it as an evil that threatens soon to grow to vast proportions. For example, in the city of Shanghai every store kept by a foreigner sells liquor, of which some is consumed on the premises. The yearly revenue from the tax on this traffic amounts to 3,600 taels ($4,140). Foreign wines and spirits are very generally used by the well-to-do classes of Chinese in that city. In the English settlement in Shanghai there were 58 arrests of Chinamen for drunkenness during the first ten months of 1889. Temperance effort is carried on by some organizations and individuals, especially by missionaries; and a cordial welcome was given to Mrs. Mary Clement Leavitt, who visited China in 1886 in behalf of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

OPIUM.

But the drink evil in China, though increasing, is overshadowed by a worse evil—worse, at least, in magnitude. This is the opium habit. No account of the alcohol conditions in this Empire will be complete without presenting the most important facts of the prevalence, alarming growth and frightful ravages of this fearful vice, and indicating the responsibility for it and the consequences of its legalization.

Very little was known until recently concerning the introduction of opium and opium smoking into China. Some writers have stoutly maintained that the vice is a very ancient one, and others have just as stoutly denied that it was ever known in China until introduced by foreigners near the close of the last century. For many of the more important facts given below regarding the history of opium in China we are indebted to the researches of Dr. Edkins, the results of which are set forth in a pamphlet published by order of the Inspector-General of Chinese Customs.[1]

The poppy was introduced into China by the Arabs in the 8th Century, A. D., and Chinese physicians at once learned to make a decoction from the seeds for medical purposes. In the 15th Century they began to prepare the juice substantially as it is done to-day, but employed it in medicine only. About 1620 tobacco and tobacco smoking were brought into Amoy from the Philippine Islands, and opium was employed among other things in preparing the tobacco for use. Probably in this insidious way the taste for opium was first cultivated. After a time opium instead of tobacco became the chief ingredient of the mixture, and it was a long while before the tobacco was entirely omitted. It was about the close of the 17th Century that the habit of opium-smoking was brought to Formosa from Java, and from Formosa it found its way to the main land. The vice had already become so prevalent in 1729 that the Emperor issued an edict commanding all opium houses to be closed and providing severe penalties for those engaged in the trade. The drug was still imported however, ostensibly for medical purposes, and the habit of smoking it was slowly extending in spite of the prohibition. At the same time native opium was being produced in considerable quantities in the Province of Yünnan.

---

[1] Opium; Historical Note; or, The Poppy in China: Shanghai, Kelley & Walsh, 1889.

In 1767 the importation amounted to about 1,000 chests annually, and the traffic was wholly in the hands of the Portuguese. When the East India Company (British) took charge of the trade in 1781 the importation was still about 1,000 chests a year. But in 1800 the Government became greatly alarmed and an edict was issued forbidding the importation of opium by any person for any purpose whatever. The severest penalties were prescribed for those violating the law—nothing less than the confiscation of the vessel, the destruction of the opium and the capital execution of the smugglers. For a time the East India Company suspended shipments, but the temptations held out by the large profits caused a formal renewal of the smuggling operations in 1821. Meanwhile the severity of the Prohibitory law had in no wise been relaxed; in 1830 strangling was the penalty for selling the drug, and in 1832 an offender was executed by strangling at Macao, in the presence of a crowd of foreigners.

The British Government of India became thoroughly committed to the policy of encouraging the illicit business and deriving from it as much revenue as possible. In 1831 and 1834 British men-of-war were sent to Canton to protect the opium interests. A crisis came in 1839. The Imperial Commissioner Lin wrote to Queen Victoria imploring her to put an end to the traffic, and committed to the flames at Canton 20,283 chests of British opium, valued at $10,000,000. This act hastened the rupture with England. There were other causes for war, and it is not likely that China would ever have consented without conflict to open her gates to the trader or the missionary; but England's demand at the close of the war, that the Chinese Government should pay an indemnity of $6,000,000 for the opium that had been destroyed, fixed forever upon her the reproach of espousing the cause of lawless smugglers, and also gave strength to the charge that China's rejection of British opium was one of the chief causes of the war. The traffic, however, was not even then legalized. The Emperor, Tao Kwang, in reply to Sir Henry Pottinger's demand for its legalization, said: "True, I cannot prevent the introduction of the poison; but nothing will induce me to raise a revenue from the vice and misery of my people." This prince was himself a reformed opium-smoker, and had lost his three eldest sons by the vice.

The establishment of an English colony at Hong Kong did not tend to lessen smuggling. While Sir H. Pottinger issued a proclamation declaring the importation of opium illegal and an order forbidding all English vessels to enter any but the five treaty ports or to sail above Shanghai, under $500 penalty for each offense, no effort was made to enforce either, but, on the contrary, officers who attempted to execute the order were given to understand that their services were not needed. In 1857 an opium smuggler flying the English flag was fired on, and this was made a pretext for the second Opium War. Canton was bombarded and England and France co-operated in a demonstration of strength which compelled the Emperor to sign the treaty of 1860 (negotiated by Lord Elgin), whereby the importation of opium was legalized; and China paid an indemnity of $10,800,000 to England and $6,000,000 to France.

Since 1860 the amount of opium imported has increased alarmingly. The following figures show the development of the import traffic under England's powerful protection: In 1790, 4,054 chests were imported; in 1799, 5,000; in 1826, 9,969; in 1830, 16,800. In 1834 the trade passed out of the hands of the East India Company into those of British officials, and in 1836 the number of chests had increased to 34,000. After that quantities were indicated by piculs (of 133⅓ lbs. each) instead of by chests. In 1850 the imports aggregated 52,925 piculs, in 1880 75,308 piculs, and in 1887 96,746 piculs.

Foreign opium having been admitted, there was no longer any reason why the natives should not be permitted to produce the article.

The quantity of opium now made in China is already two or three times as much as that imported, and the home product is increasing each year. There are still provinces where opium planting is forbidden, but the prohibition is not enforced. There is probably not a single province where it is not grown. Mr. Donald Spence, British Consul at Chungking, after very careful inquiries, reported in 1881 that the annual production of the four south-western provinces amounted to 224,000 piculs. In the same year the customs returns reported 12,700 piculs in five other provinces. From special reports gathered by the customs service in 1887 we learn that opium is grown in 16 of the 18 provinces of China proper, besides the principalities of Monkden and Manchuria. A low estimate, based upon these figures, would make the total annual production about 254,000 piculs—two and one-half times the amount imported. A fair estimate would probably increase the number to 300,000.

Opinions differ very widely as to the number of smokers, some putting it as low as two millions and others as high as eighty millions. Inspector-General Hart in 1881, by a calculation based upon the returns of the customs service, concluded there were not more than two millions—one million smokers of foreign opium and the same number of the native article. His estimate of the native production, however, was far too small, as shown by Mr. Spence's report, published the following year. With the correction, Mr. Hart's method of calculation would give not less than 3,250,000 persons addicted to the habit in 1881. In his calculation he assumed that 100 catties of raw opium would produce 70 of the prepared drug, and that an average smoker consumes three mace per day. (A mace is one-tenth of a Chinese ounce, which equals an ounce and one-third avoirdupois.) Dr. S. Wells Williams regarded two mace per day a large amount, and it is still so considered in some localities. Mr. Hart's estimate is doubtless correct for the open ports, but it is probably too high an average for the whole Empire. Upon this point he remarks that if the average daily consumption be reduced you increase the number of smokers but lessen the hurtfulness of the practice. But even two mace per day is enough to ruin a man and his family in every respect. Raw opium doubtless produces on an average 70 per cent. of pure prepared opium, but it is rarely or never smoked in this condition, being almost always adulterated to a certain extent—in some places with sesamum seed, in others with the ashes of former smokings. Some persons prefer the ashes to the original drug. This is notably true in Monkden, where the ashes command as high a price as the opium. One ounce of the ashes added to one ounce of the raw opium will produce an ounce and four-tenths of the prepared mixture, so that it is probably safe to say that there are as many ounces of the prepared article smoked as there are ounces of the raw drug. Estimating the native production at 300,000 piculs annually and the foreign importation at 100,000 piculs, allowing each smoker 3 mace per day, we reach the conclusion that there are about 5,845,333 smokers. This, however, represents but a small proportion of those who suffer from the habit.

Its evil results are numerous and far-reaching. One can easily tell an opium smoker at sight by his thin, sallow face, sunken eyes and general air of weakness and dullness. The victims find it impossible without medical help to break away from it. If a confirmed smoker from any cause is deprived of his opium, or if he attempts without assistance to give up the habit, he will suffer indescribable agony; tears flow from the eyes, there is dizziness in the head and a burning in the throat, his extremities become cold and his whole body is racked with pain.

A large number of persons visit the missionary hospitals every year to be cured of the vice. Many come, however, not because they hate the habit, but because they have exhausted their means or in order that they may reduce the daily dose. Probably one-half or three-fifths of those cured renew the practice. The cost of the drug, six cents per mace, soon consumes the means of all but the rich, for outside of foreign settlements laborers receive but six to ten cents per day and mechanics from 11 to 15 cents. The habit consumes two or three hours a day, and soon unfits a man for any work. As a result his family is reduced to want, and in not a few cases wife and daughters are sold into slavery to lead lives of shame, the proceeds of the sale going to fill the pipe of the husband and father. Many every year go to swell the ranks of professional beggars. Opium is preferred to food, and if the victim is not rescued he soon destroys himself. The use of opium deadens the moral sense too, so that the smoker becomes wholly unreliable, especially where the satisfaction of his appetite is concerned. He will lie, steal and resort to any means to fill his pipe. The opium den is also a common resort of harlots and gamblers, so that an opium smoker soon becomes addicted to other vices. In the English and French quarters at Shanghai are numbers of large establishments, handsomely furnished, which are nightly frequented by thousands of young men, and where harlots are permitted, unrestrained, to ply their shameless vocation. In 1888 there were 960 opium houses in the foreign quarter of Shanghai, as against 900 in 1887. Each of the establishments pays a tax on every pipe, and the Inspector may count the pipes as frequently as he chooses. From the 960 houses a revenue of 29,359 taels ($33,762.85) was collected in 1888. In Nankin (population about 500,000), a representative Chinese city, where there are no foreigners except the missionaries, there were about 8,400 opium dens in 1888.

Besides the injury done to the victim and his family, there is the loss to the State of millions of taels annually which might be expended for useful articles of commerce. Since 1781 India has drawn off from China no less than $1,300,000,000. The average price of a picul of foreign opium is 391 taels; duty paid, 422.60 taels; after boiling, 492.20 taels. The prices of the native drug vary considerably according to locality, the quality of the article and the amount of taxes paid. The average price in 1887 of crude opium was 277 taels per picul, and of prepared opium 357 taels. Such a traffic cannot but do great injury to legitimate trade, and many merchants have complained of it on this ground. The growing of native opium is a source of injury also because the best soil is used in its production, soil which otherwise would be used in growing breadstuffs. Thus the quantity of food is lessened and its price increased, with very serious results on certain occasions. The use of opium is said also to have a prejudicial influence on the increase of population. In the report of the Missionary Conference held at Shanghai in 1877 it is stated that Dr. Galt showed from the records of the opium patients received into his hospital that to 154 married patients of the average age of 33 years, during an average period of 7.9 years, only 146 children were born.

Practically nothing is done to-day to suppress the vice. It pervades all classes. Opium is heavily taxed, but this does not prevent consumption. The import tax on the foreign article is 30 taels per picul. The native opium is variously taxed according to locality, amounting in some places to 18 taels, in others to 103 taels per picul. In Hankow an attempt was made to levy a tax in the form of a license upon the divans of that city, but it failed. The Government since its discouraging experiences before the English wars has made no sustained effort to regulate or suppress the evil. Chinamen say they are not free to deal with opium as they like. Were England to withdraw from the market and lessen the production in her dominions, the Chinese might be encouraged to another effort. They have shown themselves not incapable of the most energetic measures. There are Chinese statesmen to-day just as earnest as the famous Commissioner Lin and far more intelligent. In 1877 the Viceroy at Nankin closed every den in the city. Unfortunately he died soon after and his successor allowed the vice to flourish unmolested.

The influence of such a trade and habit upon the missionary cause can easily be conceived. There is not only the barrier erected by the vice itself, which shuts the heart against all the appeals of the gospel, but the trade introduced and fostered by a so-called Christian Government has filled the natives with a violent hatred of everything foreign. To the heathen there is but little difference between the English trader and the English missionary, though year by year that difference is coming to be more clearly understood. The preacher of the gospel is almost daily interrupted in his discourse by the question: "Where does opium come from?" and to be taunted with the reproach that his people have brought this great curse on the land. No doubt this trade is responsible in a good degree for the slow progress of Christianity in China as compared with its rapid advance in the neighboring Empire of Japan.

No Chinaman, not even the smoker, will justify the habit. All admit it to be wholly evil. Only Englishmen interested in the revenue pretend to say that it is not injurious. But Sir Thomas Wade, one of England's most distinguished representatives in China, declared: "To me it is vain to think otherwise of the use of opium in China than as a habit many times more pernicious, nationally speaking, than the gin and whiskey drinking we deplore at home."

THE UNITED STATES AND OPIUM.

The history of the relations of the United States Government with the Chinese Empire shows a gratifying change of attitude upon the opium question. The "Convention for the Regulation of Trade" between the two countries, concluded Nov. 8, 1858, provided that the tariff on opium imported into Chinese ports by citizens of the United States should be 30 taels per 100 catties.[1] But the treaty of Dec. 17, 1880, proclaimed Oct. 5, 1881 (the United States Commissioners being James B. Angell of Michigan, John F. Swift of California and William Henry Trescot of South Carolina, and the Chinese Commissioners being Pao Chün and Li Hungtsao), provides as follows in Article 2:

"The Governments of China and of the United States mutually agree and undertake that Chinese subjects shall not be permitted to import opium into any of the ports of the United States; and citizens of the United States shall not be permitted to import opium into any of the open ports of China, to transport it from one open port to any other open port, or to buy and sell opium in any of the open ports of China. This absolute prohibition, which extends to vessels owned by the citizens or subjects of either power, to foreign vessels employed by them, or to vessels owned by the citizens or subjects of either power and employed by other persons for the transportation of opium, shall be enforced by appropriate legislation on the part of China and the United States; and the benefits of the Favored-Nation clause in existing treaties shall not be claimed by the citizens or subjects of either power as against the provisions of this article."

Chloral, Chlorodyne, Chloroform, Cocaine and Ether.—These preparations are among the most popular of medicinal agents for inducing sleep or temporarily annihilating pain. The bounds of their legitimate use, however, are overstepped by many, and they become inebriants of great fascination and tyrannous strength. Indeed, alcohol is a chief constituent of each, excepting cocaine. Chloral is made by acting on absolute alcohol with dry chlorine; chlorodyne is a mixture of chloroform with morphia, Indian hemp, prussic acid, peppermint, etc.; chloroform is produced by distilling alcohol with chloride of lime; ether is the product of alcohol and sulphuric acid, and cocaine is prepared from the coca leaf, which in its native state is a powerful and ruinous stimulant, chewed by the inhabitants of the countries where the plant grows.[2]

All of them excepting ether are of comparatively recent discovery, and they have not been generally employed in medical practice until within the last half century; but physicians testify that they are already claiming multitudes of victims. All are subtle poisons, speedily producing death when taken in undue quantities. They are more dangerous than alcoholic liquors, in that constant care must be exercised to avoid fatal doses. As intoxicants they are not consumed convivially like liquors, but in secret and alone; for they do not produce exhilaration but lethargy and insensibility. The victim, while under their influence, is therefore not violent, murderous or otherwise physically demonstrative; his symptoms rather resemble those of the opium-eater. The effects are as disastrous as those produced by opium indulgence—an insatiable appetite, demanding larger and larger quantities and occasioning an uncontrollable determination to procure the drug at any expense of money, health or honor; gradual loss of will, moral sense and self restraint, and ultimately the most serious functional disorders and distresses. Dr. Norman Kerr tells of "a married lady, the wife of a professional man," who "has cost her husband £220 for chlorodyne during the past six years, although she daily drank only one-fourth of the quantity taken by another case in which four ounces were used every day."[1] These seductive poisons are probably not yet taken very extensively among the common people. Dr. Kerr, speaking of chloral, says: "Literary men, barristers, clergymen and medical men, with some highly sensitive and nervous ladies, have been the subjects of this form of inebriety. I have known no mechanic who has become addicted to chloral, and only one or two individuals engaged in trade or mercantile pursuits."[2] The appetite for these different drugs results, in most cases, from innocent use, for the purpose of wooing sleep or deadening pain; after a few trials a morbid craving is excited, then the unfortunate habit is fixed. Sometimes victims of opium resort to chloral, chloroform, ether or cocaine in the hope of conquering their tyrant, only to find themselves slaves to an equally remorseless foe whose work of destruction is performed with greater rapidity. "Chloroform," says Dr. Kerr, "is speedier in operation than any of the other forms of inebriety except ether. The nervous depression, the sickness, the perverted nutrition and the continual languor usher in an infirm and demoralized condition of body and brain, which makes of the victim a complete wreck. Unless the mania be resisted and the disease cured, the inevitable consummation by death approaches with startling swiftness. Interspersed with the most transient visions of delight, the life of the chloroform inebriate is but a protracted misery. The visions in the early stage of the diseased manifestations are most agreeable, but later on they become weird and horrid. . . . I have generally found the chloroform habit associated with alcohol. Only in one instance, a medical man, have I seen an abstainer a chloroform *habitue.* He was, I am happy to say, completely cured."[3]

---

[1] Among the duty-free goods were tobacco, cigars, wine, beer and spirits.

[2] Both Pöppig and Von Tschudi give a doleful account of the intemperate use of coca by the inveterate coquero, as he is called—his bad health, pale lips and gums, greenish and stumpy teeth, and an ugly black mark at the angles of his mouth, his unsteady gait, yellow skin, dim and sunken eyes encircled by a purple ring, his quivering lips and his general apathy all bear evidence of the baneful effects of the coca juice when taken in excess. He prefers solitude, and when a slave to his cravings he will often take himself for days together to the silence of the woods to indulge unrestrained the use of the leaf. The habit must be very seducing, as, though long stigmatized and very generally considered as a degrading, purely Indian vice, many white Peruvians at Lima and elsewhere retire daily at stated times to chew coca. Even Europeans, Von Tschudi says, have fallen into the habit. Both he and Pöppig mention instances of white coqueros of good Peruvian families who were addicted to the vice. One is described by Pöppig who became averse to any exertion; city life and its restraints were hateful to him; he lived in a miserable hut. Once a month, at least, when irresistibly seized with the passion, he would disappear into the forest and be lost for many days, after which he would emerge sick, powerless and altered.—*Coca and Cocaine*, by William Martindale (London, 1886), pp. 12, 13.

Christian Church.—The American Christian Convention, at its quadrennial session held in New Bedford, Mass., Oct. 11, 1886, made the following deliverance:

> "Inasmuch as the subject of the limitation and ultimate extinction of the commerce in intoxicating drinks is the pre eminent moral question of to-day, and growing in emphasis with each added day; therefore
>
> "RESOLVED, That this Convention do announce itself as the patron and aider of all activities and associations that point clearly, definitely and wisely to a direct and immediate erasure of permissions or sanctions of society or law upon the iniquitous traffic."

Church Action.—The representative deliverances of American churches on temperance and Prohibition are given separately under the different denominational names.

Church of God.—The General Eldership—the highest body in this denomination—held a triennial meeting at West Newton, Pa., May, 1887. The following is taken from the report of the Committee on Temperance, which was adopted by the Eldership:

> "Statistics develop the fact that, as a nation, we annually expend in Home and Foreign Missions the sum of $2,500,000, for tobacco the sum of $600,000,000, and for intoxicating liquors the sum of $900,000,000. These expenditures for liquor and tobacco strike at the influence of the

---

[1] Inebriety (London, 1888), by Norman Kerr, M.D., F.L.S., p. 103.

[2] Ibid, pp. 101-2.

[3] Ibid, pp. 105-6.

church, the home, and the nation. Since the last meeting of this body a number of States have submitted, or are about to submit, the question of Prohibition; and so far as the question has been tested by the expressed voice of the people, the sentiment of Prohibition is fast gaining ground. All kinds of license or tax, favoring the liquor traffic, whether high or low, are wrong in principle and demand the opposition of the church and of good men and women everywhere. We not only re-affirm the sentiments heretofore expressed, but as the cause of Prohibition advances we will keep pace with the aggressive movement of the temperance cause until the several States and the National Government shall by Constitutional Amendment or statutory law prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of all intoxicating liquors, including ale, wine and beer as a beverage, and to that end we will labor and in every legitimate way use our influence."

Church Temperance Society.—This is the shorter name of the "Temperance Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America." It was organized in 1881. It is under the general control of an Executive Board of 30 members, and of the 60 Bishops of the Church who act as Vice-Presidents. The object is threefold: (1) Promotion of temperance; (2) Rescue of the intemperate; (3) Removal of the causes of intemperance. Its basis is thus defined:

"Recognizing *temperance* as the law of the gospel, and *total abstinence* as a rule of conduct essential in certain cases and highly desirable in others, and fully and freely according to every man the right to decide, in the exercise of his Christian liberty, whether or not he will adopt said rule, this Society lays down as the basis on which it rests and from which its work shall be conducted, union and co-operation on perfectly equal terms for the promotion of temperance between those who use temperately and those who abstain entirely from intoxicating drinks as beverages."

The country is divided into four general departments: (1) Central, including New York, New Jersey and Connecticut, with headquarters at 16 4th avenue, New York City. (2) New England, including Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts and Rhode Island, with Rev. S. H. Hilliard, Boston, as the Department Secretary. (3) Pennsylvania, including Pennsylvania, Delaware and Maryland, with Rt. Rev. Bishop Coleman, Wilmington, Del., as Department Secretary. (4) Ohio, including Ohio, Michigan and Indiana, with Rev. E. R. Atwill, D.D., Toledo, O., as Department Secretary

For remedial agencies the Society names the following: (1) The gospel. (2) Coffee-houses as counteractives to saloons. (3) Improved dwellings for the poor. (4) Healthy literature. To help supply the last-named want, it publishes a monthly paper called *Temperance* (New York). Its policy is that of restriction rather than Prohibition. It aims at (1) Prohibition of sale on Sunday. (2) Prohibition of sale to minors. (3) Prohibition of sale to intoxicated persons. (4) High License or tax of $1,000 on every saloon. (5) Only one saloon to each 500 people. (6) Local Option.

No pledge is administered to a child without the written consent of his parents. No alternative pledge can be taken until the person subscribing to it is 21 years of age. No life-pledge is given to any. The conditions of membership are, assent to the constitution and the payment of $1 a year. Outgrowths of the Society are juvenile organizations called the Knights of Temperance and Young Crusaders. The Chairman of the Church Temperance Society is Rev. W. R. Huntington, D.D., Rector of Grace Church, New York.

ROBERT GRAHAM.
(Secretary Church Temperance Society.)

Cider.—See VINOUS LIQUORS.

Cigarettes.—See TOBACCO.

Civil Damage Acts.—The New York Civil Damage act is representative of all measures of similar character. It provides:

"Every husband, wife child, parent, guardian, employer or other person who shall be injured in person or property or means of support by any intoxicated person, or in consequence of the intoxication, habitual or otherwise, of any person, shall have a right of action in his or her name, against any person or persons who shall, by selling or giving away intoxicating liquors, cause the intoxication, in whole or in part, of such person or persons; and any person or persons owning or renting or permitting the occupation of any building or premises, and having knowledge that intoxicating liquors are to be sold therein, shall be liable, severally or jointly, with the person or persons selling or giving intoxicating liquors as aforesaid, for all damages sustained and for exemplary damages; and all damages recovered by a minor under this act shall be paid either to such minor or to his or her parent, guardian or next friend, as the Court shall direct; and the unlawful sale or giving away of intoxicating liquors shall work a forfeiture of all rights of the lessee or tenant under any lease or contract of rent upon the premises."

For information of the extent to which the Civil Damage principle is recognized in the statutes of the various States and Territories, see LEGISLATION.

Claret.—See VINOUS LIQUORS.

Clark, Billy James.—Born in Northampton, Mass., Jan. 4, 1778, and died in Glens Falls, N. Y., March 20, 1867. He was educated at Northampton Academy, studied medicine with Dr. Hicker of Easton, N. Y., and began its practice soon after in Moreau, Saratoga County, N. Y. In 1821 he was a member of the New York Legislature, and in 1848 a Presidential Elector. He was the originator and organizer of what is known as the first temperance society in history. Having read Dr. Benjamin Rush's famous essay on the "Effects of Ardent Spirits upon the Human Mind and Body," Dr. Clark, one evening in March, 1808, called to see his friend in Moreau, Rev. Libbeus Armstrong, and startled him with the declaration: "We shall all become a community of drunkards in this town unless something is done to arrest the progress of intemperance." Mr. Clark proposed the formation of a temperance society, and with the co-operation of Rev. Mr. Armstrong drafted a constitution for "The Union Temperance Society of Moreau and Northumberland." This society was organized April 30, 1808, 43 men signing the roll. They held regular quarterly and annual meetings, and kept up the organization for 14 years. The constitution provided, among other things, that "no member shall drink rum, gin, whiskey, wine or any distilled spirits, or compositions of the same or any of them, except by advice of a physician, or in case of actual disease, also excepting at public dinners, under the penalty of 25 cents, provided that this article shall not infringe on any religious rite;" that "no member shall be intoxicated under penalty of 50 cents," and that "no member shall offer any of the above liquors to any person to drink thereof under the penalty of 25 cents for each offense."

Climatic Influences.—Wind and weather are two scapegoats that have to bear the blame of countless sins against the health laws of nature. The consequences of indoor life in an atmosphere fretting our lungs with tobacco fumes and all sorts of vile gases are ascribed to the influence of the fell March wind. Fast young men suspect a "cold" as the cause of their nervous exhaustion. Gluttons attribute their gastric chills to a draught of cool night air, or a "sudden change in the weather." But the strangest of all climatic delusions is, after all, the theory which explains the intemperance of northern nations as a necessary consequence of a low temperature. "Cold weather," our barroom physiologists inform us, "naturally prompts us to resort to ardent beverages, just as we resort to chimney-fires and warm clothing." "Fire-water" (Spanish, *aguardiente*) and many similar terms have, indeed, become international synonyms of alcoholic beverages, and together with the caustic taste of such liquors have led to the popular inference that alcohol is a chemical fuel, a liquid heat-producer, and under certain conditions a valuable substitute for calorific food and warm clothing. The lessons of instinct, however, might help even non-scientific observers to suspect the correctness of that conclusion. We may be very sure that among the countless millions of modern topers not one ever *began* to prefer alcohol to more wholesome beverages from a desire to counteract the influence of a low temperature.

A ragged child, locked up in a cold room warmed at one end by a feeble fire, and furnished with a few thin blankets and a large variety of ardent liquors, would at once make for the fire-place, and after exhausting the supply of fuel would use the blankets to supplement its scant dress; but after tasting the alcoholic samples would at once reject them as useless for any present purposes, unless experiments should suggest the plan of flinging them in the fire. In that way alcohol might be utilized as a fuel, but as a calorific beverage it is as unavailable as coal-oil. Up in Manitoba, where the mercury sinks to 55° below zero, and where half-frozen wolves would not hesitate to devour a panful of biscuits or lick up a plateful of milk and sugar, neither hunger nor frost would tempt them to touch a pailful of brandy, though it might prove the only unfrozen fluid for miles around. The reason is that instinct, through the sense of taste, would inform them that fat, starch and sugar are heat-producers and aliments, but that for the organic purposes of the animal system alcohol is as useless as spirits of turpentine. Beginners, indeed, are apt to feel chilly after a more than usually large dose of brandy, though years afterwards, when the perversion of instinct has begot a progressive poison habit, alcohol seems to answer the purposes of an organic fuel by initiating the stimulant fever which to the victim of the besetting vice has become a periodic necessity; but for all actual benefit to his system the stimulant dupe might as well have tried to excite that fever by dosing himself with sulphate of quinine. Science fully explains those facts.

The experiments of Prof. Rentz and Dr. Hammond have proved that under the influence of alcohol and similar narcotic poisons the elimination of carbonic acid is diminished, the supply of animal heat being thus decreased in proportion to the alcoholic dose. For calorific purposes, alcohol is not only inferior to fat, starch and sugar, but even to common spring-water which offers its elements of hydrogen in a far more available form, while brandy merely counterfeits a momentary feeling of warmth (the effect of a scorching irritant) but in its net result does not assist but directly hinders the organic process by which the body maintains its normal temperature. "Are ardent spirits necessary?" asks Captain Edward Perry, after a 12 years' experience in the coldest climate ever braved by Arctic explorers. "I say decidedly, no. It is said they keep the cold out. I say they do not. They let the cold in."

The idea that alcohol counteracts the malarial tendency of a sultry climate is an equally baneful delusion. Every "bitters"-cursed city of our Southern gulf-coast should publish the memorandum of the Rev. James Gregson, a British missionary who passed many years in the lowland regions of Southern Hindustan. "I can appeal to returns," he says, "which have not been collected by rabid bigots but signed by medical officers, and which tell you what I believe to be the honest truth, that India's bottle has buried more than India's sun. The man who goes to Bengal with the notion that he need not relinquish his liquor, will be in danger of having to relinquish his life. Nearly all those cases of so-called heart-apoplexy would more properly be called bottle-apoplexy."

The abstinent Arabs have preserved their physical vigor in the burning desert of their native peninsula. How is it that a far more bracing climate has failed to prevent the degeneration of the alcoholized Spaniards and Italians? Shall we adopt the view of a German ethnologist who ascribes that enervation to the luxuries and vices of the Roman Empire? In Rome itself that explanation might perhaps hold good; but what about the outlying provinces which, long after the fall of Rome, were conquered by hardy tribes of Northland warriors? What about Sicily, for instance, where not drunken Romans but abstemious Saracens were expelled by a legion of iron-fisted Normans, who, towards the end of the 11th Century, followed Robert Guiscard across the strait of Messina? It so happens that the descendants of those mail-clad giants can still be traced by their Norman-French names; and it likewise so happens that an abundance of "good cheap country wine" has turned them into the puniest and sickliest bipeds of the Mediterranean coastlands.

FELIX L. OSWALD.

Coffee-Houses.—Coffee-houses as rivals of liquor-taverns have been favored almost from the beginning of the active temperance agitation. As early as 1830 and 1831 there was a coffee-house movement in Scotland, under the auspices of temperance societies, resulting in the successful operation of such establishments in nearly all the principal towns and cities, but many of them at that time sold the lighter alcoholic beverages as well as tea and coffee. It was in protest against this practice that the Dunfermline Society, Sept. 21, 1830, formed itself into the "Dunfermline Association for the promotion of temperance by the relinquishment of all intoxicating liquors," and passed a resolution agreeing "to give no encouragement or support to any coffee-house established or receiving countenance from any temperance society, for the sale of intoxicating liquors."[1] In 1844 [2] "the coffee-houses of Glasgow, conducted on strict temperance principles, and provided with news-rooms, etc., were in some respects much superior to the coffee-taverns and palaces of the present day." But it is more recently, and in England especially, that the coffee-house has become a prominent feature of the temperance movement. Liverpool, Birmingham, Bradford and other large cities in England are plentifully supplied with these places, while in London, where the development has been slower, a large number of establishments have been opened by the Lockhart Coffee-House Company, with the prospect of a rapid increase in the number. Two weekly newspapers in London, the *Temperance Caterer* and the *Refreshment News* (the latter the organ of the Coffee-Tavern Protection Society), are especially devoted to the coffee-house movement and its interests. In 1872, Rev. Charles Garrett conceived the idea of a coffee-saloon in Liverpool, which should combine every attraction of the liquor-saloon except the bar, and a company was formed, and such a place, with reading-room attached, was opened near the docks. Refreshments were served at the cheapest rates. The enterprise was so successful that there are at present in Liverpool more than 60 of these cocoa-rooms, as they are called, while the British Workman's Cocoa-House Company of Liverpool, which has them in charge, has in no year paid less than 10 per cent. dividends. Coffee-houses were established in Bradford after their success was manifest in Liverpool, and the Bradford Coffee-House Company has opened 20 places in that city and its suburbs. Birmingham also is plentifully supplied with coffee-houses, or coffee-house hotels, and they are successful from a business point of view, as well as influential in moulding temperance sentiment. The coffee-house movement has extended into Canada and Australia, but has made little progress in the United States. Probably the nearest approaches to the English coffee-house to be found in this country are the temperance restaurants established in various cities by enterprising or philanthropic persons, those opened and very successfully managed by Joshua L. Baily in Philadelphia being especially worthy of mention.

---

[1] Dawson Burns's "Temperance History," vol. 1, p. 48.

[2] Ibid, p. 248.

Collier, William.—Born in Scituate, Mass., Oct. 11, 1771, and died in Boston, Mass., March 29, 1843. He learned the carpenter's trade, and afterwards decided to fit himself for the ministry. He graduated from Brown University in 1797, and two years later was ordained as a clergyman. In 1800 he became a pastor in New York City, where he remained four years. He had charge of a church in Charlestown, Mass., from 1804 until 1820, and then engaged in mission work in Boston. He was a pioneer in the temperance movement and projected and published the first temperance newspaper in history—the *National Philanthropist*, started in Boston in March, 1826. Originally a monthly, it was issued weekly after the first three months and until it was discontinued two years later. This paper bore the following significant mottoes: "Temperate drinking is the downhill road to intemperance;" "Distilled spirits ought to be banished from the land, and what ought to be done, can be done." In 1827 Mr. Collier became the editor of the *Baptist Preacher*. He also compiled a hymn-book, and edited various works for publication.

Colorado.—See Index.

Commercial Temperance League.—I had read the delightful work of Rev. E. E. Hale, entitled "Ten Times One is Ten," and had written a letter to the author, in which I boastingly claimed to be a decided temperance man. His reply contained the following sentence: "No man is sure he is temperate himself until he tries to make other people so." That searching sentence led me to conclude that my temperance principles should be heavily discounted, and I resolved to make an advance. I arranged a meeting with Dr. Hale and a few invited friends on a certain day in 1886, in C. W. Anderson's insurance office, 185 Broadway, New York. Then and there ten of us organized a "Ten Times One is Ten" Club for temperance work. The widespread organization that has sprung from this beginning is appropriately called the Commercial Temperance League.

The object of the League is revealed in its mottoes and pledges. The mottoes are the same as those adopted by the King's Daughters:

"Look up and not down."
"Look forward and not back."
"Look out and not in."
"Lend a hand."

Its pledge is two-fold: (1) To drink no intoxicating liquor as a beverage. (2) To try and get ten others to join the League. We consider that a compliance with the first pledge simply gives the person a start, while adherence to the second means an aggressive movement towards the saloon's destruction.

The membership cannot be definitely stated. It was over 4,000 prior to Jan. 1, 1890. As a large proportion of its members are commercial travelers, it is difficult to keep track of their movements. Upon the basis of 4,000 members, if each one should keep both pledges, the number would very soon swell to 40,000. But traveling men are exposed to special temptations, and too many fall by the wayside.

As to methods, the League depends largely upon personal solicitation, always, however, insisting upon two things —abstinence and work. All kinds of temperance activity are encouraged, whether on the score of health or economy, philanthropy or morality, religion or politics. Some of the members do platform work, others furnish money for the distribution of literature, and all are expected to be supplied with our pledge-cards for use at any time or place. Clubs have been organized in many of the leading cities. Merchants, clerks, commercial travelers, manufacturers, lawyers and ministers have identified themselves with the movement. A large number have taken the double pledge, and been redeemed from the drink slavery, and sleepy church-members have been awakened to see that they cannot be consistent Christians unless they "lend a hand" toward the obliteration of the alcohol curse. S. A. Haines,

President Commercial Temperance League.

Commission of Inquiry.— See United States Government and the Liquor Traffic.

Common Law.—This term as used in the United States embraces both the common law of England strictly so-called and the acts of the British Parliament of a general nature and not inapplicable here, passed before the earliest English immigrants, who remained permanently here, left their native land on the 19th of December, 1606, in the 4th year of James I. (Bishop's 1st Book of the Law, Sections 50 to 57.) The common law of England blended together the usages and customs of the nations and clans that successively conquered and inhabited the island of Great Britain, or parts of it. (2 Wait's A. & D., 278.) The earliest decisions made by the Courts of England simply reflected the state of civilization and enlightenment then existing there. These decisions became "precedents" or "authority" for subsequent decisions upon the principles involved, and under the rule known as *stare decisis* the Courts of modern times have followed these early decisions, even in cases where they were contrary to their own notions of right and justice, rather than introduce the element of uncertainty in the law by overruling them and establishing a rule in accord with the advance made in civilization. Hence it has become necessary with every advance made by society in civilization and enlightenment to change by statutory enactment some old rule of the common law. This is well illustrated by the legislation of modern times on the rights and disabilities of married women. The old common law status of married women has been completely revolutionized by this legislation.

The selling of intoxicating liquors was looked upon as a lawful means of livelihood by the English people centuries ago when the question first came before the English Courts, and hence unless the place where the intoxicating liquors were sold was conducted in a disorderly manner no offence was adjudged to have been committed (Bishop on Crim. Law, Vol. I, Sec. 1113; 2 Kent Com., 12th ed., p. 597 in note; Cooley on Torts, 2d ed., side-page 605, top p. 718; 4 Comyns Digest, p. 822; Faulkner's Case, 1 Saunders's Rep., 249; Stevens v. Watson, 1 Salkeld's Rep., p. 45; King v. Marriot, 4 Modern Rep., 144; Rex v. Inyes, 2 Showers's Rep., 468.) In the case of Commonwealth v. McDonough (13 Allen [Mass.] Rep., 581), decided in 1866, a Boston saloon-keeper was indicted "for the illegal sale and illegal keeping for sale of intoxicating liquors to the great injury and common nuisance of the citizens of the Commonwealth." After the indictment the statute was repealed under which the indictment had been obtained, and so the prosecution endeavored to secure a conviction on the ground that the keeping of a saloon was contrary to the common law. The case was carried up to the highest Court in the State and ably argued. In deciding the case the Supreme Court said:

> "It is further contended that the offence set forth in the complaint was a nuisance at common law, and may be punished as such, if it is held that the statute penalty is repealed. No authority is cited in favor of this position, and those which we have examined are opposed to it. In 1 Bishop Crim. Law. Sec. 1,047, it is said that, aside from statutory provisions, a crime is not committed by selling intoxicating liquors. Merchants have always dealt in wines and other liquors in large quantities, without being subject to prosecution at common law. Inn-keeping was a lawful trade, open to every subject without license at common law. If he should corrupt wines or victuals an action lay against him. He might recover the price of wines sold by him by action of debt. (Bac. Ab. Inns. 8 Co., 147.) So it was lawful to keep an alehouse. (1 Russell on Crimes, 298 in note [2d ed.].) In the argument for the Commonwealth, such places as the defendant is charged with keeping are classed with brothels and gaming-houses, and it is argued that they are all equally nuisances. But it was not so at common law. Brothels and gaming-houses were held to be nuisances under all circumstances, but ale-houses were not, unless they became disorderly, and in such cases they were held to be nuisances on account of the disorderly conduct in them, whether the keeper were licensed or not. As it is not alleged that the defendant kept a disorderly house, he cannot be held guilty of an offence at common law."

License laws were first enacted in 1552 by the British Parliament in the fifth and sixth years of Edward VI. (1 Russell on Crimes, 2d ed., p. 298, note.) License laws continued to exist in England at the time our ancestors departed for America in 1606, but the provisions for granting a license were so locally inapplicable to the American colonies that they have never been held to be in force here by any Court in any reported case.

From the foregoing it will be seen that the common law of the United States on the subject of liquor-selling simply reflects the views entertained on the subject by a half-civilized people ages ago, and that the views of the enlightened people of the United States on the subject can be found only in Constitutional and statutory law. As great changes have taken place in public opinion with the advance of civilization in relation to slavery, polygamy, lotteries and other things now universally regarded as evils but once considered lawful and right, so it is not surprising that public sentiment has also changed in reference to liquor-selling.

SAMUEL W. PACKARD.

Communion Wine.—The importance of the inquiry whether Jesus appointed intoxicating or unfermented wine for the communion service has interested in every age of the Christian Church able leaders who have regarded it a test question as to the purity of Christian morality. While all the leading writers of the first five Christian centuries recognized that the wines made, drank and used at the Passover and Last Supper by Christ were the fresh "fruit" of the vine, the difficulty of obtaining such wines in Africa and Northern Europe led no less than twenty fathers of the first five centuries, and, later, men like Photius of the Greek Church in the 9th Century, Aquinas of the Roman Church in the 13th Century, and Bingham of the English Church early in the 18th Century to an exhaustive study of methods of preparing unintoxicating wines, and to review the discussions and decisions of successive Christian Councils on communion wine as all-important in Christian morals. Its growing moral bearings, recognized in all branches of the Christian Church, has led on to the exhaustive research which now permits demonstrative conclusions. As the prior question whether Nazarites were to be excluded from the Passover or to be required to violate their pledge of abstinence is settled by the connected records of Numbers, 6th to 18th chapters, so Luke's connection, as a Greek physician acquainted with wines, of John's abstinence (1:15), of popular comment on it (7:33, 34) and the "fruit of the vine" used at both the Passover and communion observance (22:18, comp. Matt. 26:29, and Mark 14:25), is a necessary guide to an exhaustive and therefore conclusive decision as to the wine appointed for the Lord's Supper. With this prior consideration in view, the successive steps in research are the following: (1) Christ as a "conforming Jew" must, as to the wine of the Passover, have strictly followed the Mosaic statute and the historic precedent which from the days of Moses to the present time has ruled the character of wine used in Hebrew rites. (See PASSOVER WINE.) (2) The word "wine" is not used in the account of the Supper given by three evangelists; but the term "fruit of the vine" is applied by Luke to the cup of the Passover (22:18), and by Matthew (26:29) and Mark (14:25) to the same cup used at the Communion. (3) At no age, in no land and among no people, as among the Romans under their Republic, especially for two centuries before Christ, was the method of preserving wines free from intoxicating ferment so studied and practiced; while no class of men were so true to moral virtue as were the Roman Centurions mentioned in the lives of Christ and of his Apostles; a fact noted by Matthew as a reproof to his countrymen (8:10; 27: 54), and especially repeated by Luke, who wrote for cultured Greeks (7:2, 4, 5, 9; 23:47; Acts 10:1, 2, 7, 34, 35; 21:32; 22:25, 26; 23:27; 27: 1, 3, 43; 28:16). (4) The fact that from the time of his making "fresh wine," Greek "kalon" (John 2:10) for a wedding, to his rejection of wine on the cross, Jesus drank only the unintoxicating fresh product of the grape, confirms not only the former facts stated, but the added fact that the wine of Christ's Supper was the fresh product of the grape. (5) The allusions of Paul, the first to give a written account of the Lord's Supper (1. Cor. 11: 20-26), have by the ablest Christian scholars, from the 2d to the 19th Centuries, been declared to have been conformed to Christ's example, for these reasons: First, Corinth furnished then, and the Greek Isles now export, preserved unfermented wine; Second, The term "wine" is not used by Paul, as it was not by Christ; Third, The beverage in "the cup" is supposed to be familiar. The Greek verb "methuo," found seven times (Matt. 24:49; John 2:10; Acts 2:15; 1 Cor. 11:21; 1 Thess. 5:7; Rev. 17:2, 6), means "surfeit," not drunken, as does the noun "methusma" in the Greek translation of Hos. 4:11; the contrast in 1 Cor. 11:21 being with "hungry," and clearly relating to food, not to articles of drink.

The facts as to the New Testament record relating to "communion wine" are confirmed in each age succeeding the day of Christ and his Apostles. Clement in Egypt in the 2d Century alludes to the Christian "Enkratites" or total abstainers; who, living in lower Egypt, had no vines; and who, citing the fact that in 1 Cor. 11 Paul does not mention wine but only "the cup," used water at the Lord's Supper. He mentions Greek sects as the Pythagorians, who drank no wine, but cites David's pure beverages, the fresh product of the grape; he declares that the cup of the Lord's Supper is the "blood of the grape-cluster," and, stating that the wine Christ made at the wedding was the same, he repeats Christ's words thus: "This is my blood, the blood of the vine," as alluding to John 15:1, in the figures "I am the vine, and ye are the branches." Origen, in the opening of the 3d Century, alludes to three kinds of wine: the ordinary intoxicating wine, the wine diluted with water, and the "sweet nectar" of Homer and of the Greeks, which he declares is Christ's appointment. Cyprian, at Carthage in Northern Africa, in the middle of the 3d Century, cites Melchisedech, quoted by Christ and Paul as well as David (Psa. 110:1, 4; Matt. 22: 44; Heb. 5:6; 6:20; 7:17, 21) as prefiguring his sacrifice, and so his memorial Supper (Gen. 14:18); and, quoting Gen. 49:11, he asks, "When here the blood of the grape is mentioned, what else than the wine of the cup of the Lord's blood is set forth?" He cites David's beverage of fresh grape juice in his shepherd life (Psa. 23:5), and the wine made fresh and declared "the best" (*optimum* in Latin) as that used at the Supper. Zeno, at Verona in Northern Italy, in the 3d Century, states that the cup of the Lord's Supper was fresh "grape-juice" (*mustum*); he declares that it was the simple beverage of Melchisedech, Abraham, Joseph and Jesus in Palestine, and also like the Grecian "gleukos" referred to Acts 2:13. Chrysostom, court-preacher at Constantinople at the close of the 4th Century, condemning the custom of wine-drinking, meets the objection that it was appointed for the Lord's Supper; and declares that Christ, foreseeing this perversion, was careful in selecting the terms, "I will drink no more of the fruit of this, the vine." Jerome, who spent 30 years in Palestine at the close of the 4th and the opening of the 5th Century, that he might see, in the land where Jesus lived, and verify every fact in his history, says of the wine of the Supper, citing Christ's words "The fruit of the vine," that it was fresh from the noble vine (Gen. 49:11), and like the "tirosh" of Hos. 2:8, 9, 22. Augustine, going from Rome as a gospel herald to Carthage early in the 5th Century, meeting the difficulty of providing fresh wine for the Lord's Supper and the perversion made of Christ's appointment, alludes to Virgil's mention in his Georgics of the simple country provision of "milk, honey and must." He cites the "tirosh" blessed by Isaac, as Christ's beverage; and he declares that the cup of the Lord's table is what a little child may drink.

In successive ages since these early Christian leaders saw how vital the question whether Jesus was behind the Greek and Roman patriots of his day in guarding his followers from perversion of his example and appointment, profound and conscientious scholars in every branch of the Christian Church, in lands where the vine and its richest fruits were not, as in Palestine, native to the clime, have reviewed all this testimony. Thus, Photius, a leader in the separation between the Greek and Roman Churches in the middle of the 9th Century, in maintaining the custom of the Eastern Church, which administers the cup even to children, comments as a native Greek on Christ's words as to "new wine" and "the fruit of the vine" as taught in all former and subsequent ages. Aquinas, born in Italy but spending his early life in France and Western Germany, is called to remonstrate against the wine sometimes used; and retraces at great length the Old and New Testament history, showing that Christ used in his Supper fresh "wine of the vine;" urging that "True wine can be carried to those countries where there are no wines, as much as is sufficient for the sacrament," and stating that where grapes of inferior quality grow, as on the Rhine, "This sacrament can be observed with must," since "must has already the character of wine."

In the differences that arose between the Protestant Episcopal Church and the various dissenting churches in the close of the 17th and the opening of the 18th Centuries, a thorough and exhaustive review of former authorities was made by Poole, as a scholarly and uncontroversial dissenter, and by Bingham of the Established Church of England; both reaching like conclusions. The earnest spirit of Whitefield and Wesley reviewed a little later the call for a return to a pure, unintoxicating wine for the Lord's Supper; and in the early part of the 19th Century Adam Clarke wrought conclusions of former scholars into his commentary. At the era of its publication, many conscientious Christian leaders, who from the era of Whitefield's first visit had longed and labored in New England for a return to Christ's pure appointment, found in Moses Stuart an intelligent advocate, though his declining age forbade exhaustive research. In 1829, John N. Barbour of Boston imported from the Grecian Isles, in bottles, pure wines, which when analyzed by the eminent Dr. John A. Warren were found free from alcohol. The progress of the popular demand by reformed inebriates, like Gough, and by students like Lees of England and Nott and others in the United States, has steadily confirmed the truth taught by Christ, and has promoted the "grace" which his example and his appointment have inspired. The special confirmation which the monuments of Egypt have given as to the early method of preparing and preserving unfermented wine, and the reopening of Palestine for the repetition of the studies of Jerome, and, yet more, the revival in Italy aud Spain, as well as in California, of ancient methods, has facilitated the return to the use of unfermented wine at the Lord's Supper specially sought in Great Britain and America by reformed inebriates. G. W. Samson.

Compensation.—One of the most perplexing questions arising after the Prohibition movement was fairly inaugurated was, Should liquor-manufacturers and sellers be reimbursed for their losses when their traffic is forbidden and their business establishments are closed? In the United States it was not until forty years of Prohibitory legislation had elapsed that the question was definitely disposed of by the Court of last resort. Meanwhile decisions for and against the principle of compensation were made by minor Courts; but by common consent the question was held in abeyance everywhere in the country throughout this period. Although it was much discussed by individual writers—and even some Prohibitionists maintained the affirmative view[1]—it is a remarkable fact that no definite political following or championship of an important nature was ever commanded by the advocates of compensation in the United States. While the liquor-sellers readily secured partisan support for their offensive and defensive schemes in relation to every other phase of policy, they could not persuade political leaders to make a popular issue of the one programme whose acceptance was essential to the welfare of the traffic. These leaders were frequently prepared to stand or fall in opposing Prohibition or Local Option, or in urging even the most scandalous of license bills. They were prepared to become responsible for elaborate and unscrupulous plans to defeat advanced legislation and protect the licensed dealers. But in spite of the powerful and persevering resistance of political parties, Prohibitory systems were adopted, costly manufacturers' plants became all but worthless, liquors were seized and destroyed and wholesalers and retailers suffered very heavy pecuniary losses; while even the most faithful political friends of the traffic made no formal effort of importance to award damages.

UNPOPULARITY OF COMPENSATION.

This disinclination to take partisan ground in favor of indemnifying dispossessed license-holders was occasioned by the strong repugnance to compensation prevailing among the people. A compensation clause attached to any Prohibitory, Local Option or restrictive license act would have been the most effectual provision that could have been devised for preventing popular consent to the anti-license policy; but it was unavailable because the device was exceedingly distasteful to the general public. When the Pennsylvania Legislature, in January, 1887, was preparing to submit to the people the question of adding a Prohibitory Amendment to the State Constitution, the caucus of the dominant party (Jan. 4) voted to submit for popular decision at the same time a clause providing "That compensation shall be made out of the public treasury to all owners or lessees of real estate lawfully occupied or used continually from April 1, 1887, until the final adoption of this Amendment, for the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage so far as the said real estate shall be injured by the adoption of the foregoing Prohibition Amendment; and the General Assembly shall provide by law for a true and just valuation and the payment of losses so sustained." The Pennsylvania act of submission was framed and carried through the Legislature by very shrewd partisan leaders, who subsequently showed that they were ready to use any expedient means for protecting the traffic; but they quickly withdrew their compensation proviso. The caucus eliminated it from the act of submission on Jan. 24. Again, in Nebraska (February, 1887) and in Illinois (March, 1887) it was proposed by legislative leaders to submit Prohibitory Amendments conditioned on compensation, but these schemes came to nothing. Indeed, actual compensation has never been granted as an incident of Prohibitory laws in the United States,[2] and the sense of the people upon the question has been so well understood that no emphatic expression of it has been invited.

Popular objection to compensation has naturally been based chiefly on reasons of economy. The policy if applied in any State would enormously increase the public budget and taxation—all for the benefit of a single class, a class regarded by most citizens as particularly undeserving, corrupt and even criminal. It was not needful for one to be a Prohibitionist to oppose compensation on economical grounds. Besides, the compensation principle, if approved, would have to be observed under license as well as under Prohibitory systems. Should it be desired to restrict the number of licenses in any community the restriction would have to be attended by compensation to all licensed dealers deprived of their former privileges. Since it was universally recognized that no efforts to abolish the license system or even to reduce the aggregate number of saloons could be made with satisfactory prospects of success if compensation were indispensable, the advocates of restriction and other conservative temperance people were equally interested with the Prohibitionists in resisting the liquor-sellers' demands.

---

[1] Notably the late W. H. H. Bartram.

[2] In some towns, however, liquor-sellers have been paid sums of money from local public funds or by private individuals, in consideration of their willingness to surrender their licenses and quit business.

But the expediency argument was far from representing the strongest objections entertained by uncompromising antagonists of the traffic. Thomas Carlyle's retort to the publican's plea for compensation, "Go to thy father the devil for compensation!" was the answer that temperance radicals were disposed to give. If it was urged that the Government, having become a partner in the licensed liquor business and shared the proceeds, was in honor bound to pay losses incurred by individual liquor-sellers upon discontinuance of the partnership arrangement, it was answered that the Government had suffered incalculably in tolerating the saloons and, being a loser by the bargain, had no debt to discharge; that such a traffic ought to be dealt with as a robber and not as a producer; that the Government, by making licenses subject to revocation for various causes, and by holding itself in readiness to prohibit the business altogether at the call of public sentiment, had served the liquor-sellers with notice to quit, and that since all licenses expired annually and were granted from year to year as special and temporary privileges, there could be no "vested rights," properly so-called.

EARLY JUDICIAL UTTERANCES.

In the early stages of the Prohibitory agitation, prestige was given to the most radical claims of the liquor traffic's enemies by the very impressive language used by Justices of the United States Supreme Court in deciding the celebrated "License Cases" of 1847. (See 5 Howard, 504.) In separate opinions filed by the individual justices in passing upon these cases, the right to prohibit the traffic was thoroughly sustained. Although there was no formal discussion of the compensation question the failure of the Court to raise this question as one legitimately demanding consideration in a review of the general principles involved was highly significant. Indeed, it was unmistakably to be inferred from the tenor of the Justices' written opinions, that the claim of liquor-sellers to compensation was not recognized by the Court at that time. "The acknowledged police power of a State," said Justice McLean, "extends often to the destruction of property. A nuisance may be abated. Everything prejudicial to the health or morals of a city may be removed." "If a loss of revenue should accrue to the United States from a diminished consumption of ardent spirits," said Justice Grier, "she will be the gainer a thousand-fold in the health, wealth and happiness of the people."

In 1856 the New York State Court of Appeals, in its decision in the case of People v. Wynehamer pronouncing the New York Prohibitory law unconstitutional, held that an act operating to destroy existing property in liquors was in violation of the provision of the State Constitution that no person should be deprived of property without due process of law. This view of the Court applied, however, only to liquor property actually existing at the time of the passage of the Prohibitory act; and the Court was of the opinion that a Prohibitory statute would be valid in principle if operating against prospective and not against existing liquor property. The implication was that the failure to make compensation for property destroyed or injured by the act was, in the opinion of the New York Court of Appeals, sufficient justification for concluding that "due process of law" had not been provided for by the framers of the legislation in question. But even this Court avoided direct discussion of the compensation issue.

JUDGE BREWER'S DECISION.

It was not until 1886 that the argument for compensation was explicitly defined by a judicial decision of first-rate respectability. In the 39 years that had passed since the "License Cases" were before the United States Supreme Court, conditions had been altered by the adoption (1868) of the 14th Amendment to the Federal Constitution, declaring in part that "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." The terms of this Amendment were made the basis for a sweeping decision by the Hon. David J. Brewer, Judge of the 8th Circuit Court of the United States. In the case of the State of Kansas, *ex rel.*, v. John Walruff, *et al.*, Jan. 21, 1886, Judge Brewer held that while the State could unquestionably prohibit the manufacture and sale of liquors for beverage purposes, such prohibition, if unaccompanied by provisions for compensating the owners of existing liquor property, would not be in accordance with "due process of law." John Walruff was a brewer, who between 1870 and 1874 had erected an establishment at Lawrence, Kan., which was worth $50,000 for the purpose of brewing beer, and worth not more than $5,000 for any other purpose. The State of Kansas, in 1880, adopted a Prohibitory Amendment to its Constitution, and subsequently an enforcement statute. Walruff accordingly claimed damages in the amount of $45,000.

Judge Brewer, in this celebrated case, argued that Walruff's liquor property had been "acquired under every solemn unlimited guaranty of protection to property which Constitutional declaration and the underlying thought of just and stable government could give;" that "debarring a man by express prohibition from the use of his property for the sake of the public is a taking of private property for public uses;" that "national equity as well as Constitutional guaranty forbids such a taking of private property for the public good without compensation," and that the confiscation of Walruff's brewing property was no more to be justified on strict legal grounds than the confiscation of a glucose factory, a concern for the manufacture of playing cards, or even a flouring mill would be in the event of legislative Prohibition of such manufacturing enterprises.

The significance of the Walruff decision was heightened by important circumstances. It was delivered by a Federal Court standing next in authority to the Supreme Court. Judge Brewer was a Republican and a citizen of Kansas; moreover, as a member of the Kansas Supreme Court he had given his voice for sustaining the Prohibitory law on various Constitutional grounds[1]—yet for the sake of the compensation principle he ventured to take issue with the policy of his party and the strong public sentiment prevailing in Kansas, and to champion a programme which, if established, would render his other decisions on the Prohibition question all but worthless in practice. More interesting than anything else was the knowledge that the compensation question was now regarded by the United States Supreme Court with profound and apparently portentous seriousness. In the case of Bartemeyer v. Iowa (18 Wallace, 129) the Supreme Court had said:

> "But if it were true, and it was fairly presented to us, that the defendant was the owner of the glass of intoxicating liquor which he sold to Hickey at the time that the State of Iowa first imposed an absolute Prohibition upon the sale of such liquors, then we concede that two very grave questions would arise, namely: First, whether this would be a statute depriving him of his property without due process of law; and, secondly, whether if it were so, it would be so far a violation of the 14th Amendment in that regard as would call for judicial action by this Court.
>
> "Both of these questions, whenever they may be presented to us, are of an importance to require the most careful and serious consideration. They are not to be lightly treated, nor are we authorized to make any advance to meet them until we are required to do so by the duties of our position."

And in the case of Beer Company v. Massachusetts (97 U. S., 25) the Supreme Court had used these still more suggestive words:

> "We do not mean to say that [liquor] property actually in existence, and in which the right of the owner has become vested, may be taken for the public good without compensa-

---

[1] But Judge Brewer was equally outspoken for compensation when on the Kansas Supreme Bench. In January, 1883, in the case of Kansas v. Peter Mugler (29 Kansas 152), although all the other Judges fully sustained the Prohibitory law, Judge Brewer filed a dissenting opinion, advocating compensation. In it occurred several remarkable words which were afterwards cited by the Prohibitionists as evidence that he was actuated by intolerance. "But as to the case in which the charge is of manufacturing beer," said he, "and without regard to the purpose for which it was manufactured, while I do not care to formally dissent I must say that my mind is not fully satisfied. The defendant may have manufactured the beer for his own consumption. It certainly is not shown or alleged that he did not, and in a criminal proceeding it is not to be presumed that the defendant has done wrong. And I have yet to be convinced that the Legislature has the power to prescribe what a citizen shall eat or drink, or what medicine he shall take, or prevent him from growing or manufacturing that which his judgment approves for his own use as food, drink or medicine." The raising by the Judge of a most unreasonable supposition in the brewers' favor, and the employment by him of language closely resembling that appearing in "personal liberty" arguments, excited severe criticism.

Judge Brewer was transferred to the United States Circuit Court soon after he gave his dissenting opinion in this case. It was charged by the Topeka *Capital*, chief Republican newspaper of Kansas, Jan. 26, 1886, that his promotion was due to the representations in his favor made to President Arthur by Senator Vest (Dem.), leading counsel of the brewers. (See the *Voice* for Jan. 16, 1890.)

Upon his elevation to the Supreme Bench of the United States, Judge Brewer made a statement to a newspaper correspondent reviewing his connection with the compensation cases. He recited the facts but expressed no regret for his action. (See the *Voice* for Jan. 9, 1890.)

tion, but we infer that liquor in this case, as in the case of Bartemeyer v. Iowa, was not in existence when the liquor law of Massachusests was passed."

THE COMPENSATION CASES IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

For nearly two years after the Circuit Court's decision in the Walruff case, the Supreme Court refrained from giving its judgment. In October, 1886, however, the Iowa cases of Schmidt Bros. v. E. M. Cobb, and Arthur O'Malley v. J. P. Farley, involving the question of compensation, were passed on by the Supreme Court (119 U. S., 286). At that time one of the nine Justices of the Court (Woods) was incapacitated by sickness from joining in consideration of the cases, and the other eight Justices were equally divided. This equal division of the Supreme Court only 14 months previously to its emphatic and all but unanimous denial of the right to compensation, is one of the most curious facts in the history of judicial treatment of the Prohibition issue.[1]

In the spring of 1887 two cases carried up from the Kansas Supreme Court which that tribunal had decided adversely to the interests of Peter Mugler, brewer, were argued in the United States Supreme Court. Senator George G. Vest (Dem.) of Missouri, employed by the United States Brewers' Association, represented the liquor side, and the argument of the Prohibitionists was presented in a brief prepared under the direction of Attorney-General Bradford of Kansas. After the hearing of the Mugler cases it was by mutual consent arranged that another Kansas Prohibition case, that of Ziebold & Hagelin, brewers (appealed by the State of Kansas from Judge Brewer's Circuit Court), should be advanced on the docket of the United States Supreme Court so that a decision in it might be reached with that in the Mugler cases. The Court listened to further argument on the 11th of October, 1887, the Hon. Joseph H. Choate (Rep.), of the eminent New York law firm of Evarts, Choate & Beaman, appearing for the brewers. The Prohibitionists were not represented by counsel. It was afterwards shown that the brewers had managed their interests before the Supreme Court with consummate skill. Mr. Choate's services had been engaged secretly, and it was not known that he was in the employ of the brewers until his argument had been made. Mr. Vest was paid a fee of $10,000, and Mr. Choate received $6,144.90.[2] On the other hand the arguments of the Prohibitionists were not adequately presented. After the hearing on the 11th of October an effort was made by Samuel W. Packard of Chicago, representing the National Prohibition party, to induce the Court to reopen the cases and hear additional argument, but the Court refused.

Mr. Choate, in urging the claims of Ziebold & Hagelin, set up the following plea:

"In 1871, while as yet beer was as much a part of the daily food of the people of Kansas as bread and meat, they purchased a brewery in that State, of which they were citizens, investing in it their entire property. From time to time they enlarged and improved it, adding largely to their investment Meanwhile the taxes on their property and business contributed to the support and welfare of the State, as the products of their brewery did to the wholesome sustenance of its inhabitants. It was a peaceful and legitimate industry, as beneficent as the bakers' or the butchers', contributing to the community what for centuries had been a staple beverage of the Anglo-Saxon race."

SWEEPING DECISION AGAINST COMPENSATION.

On the 5th of December, 1887, the Supreme Court announced its decision in the two Mugler cases and the Ziebold & Hagelin case. The eight Justices who had participated in the "divided" opinion of the Court in the Iowa cases in October, 1886, were still on the bench. Meantime Justice Wood had died and his place had not been filled. Justice Harlan read the decision, which was concurred in by Chief-Justice Waite and Justices Miller, Bradley, Matthews, Gray and Blatchford, Justice Field alone dissenting.[1] The principles laid down thus received the sanction of the highest Court by a vote of seven to one; and three of the seven Justices promulgating these principles had radically changed attitude in 14 months. The compensation idea was rejected in explicit and solemn language, and Constitutional questions scarcely less important than the question of compensation were decided in the interest of the Prohibitionists—particularly those affecting the right of a State to prohibit the manufacture of liquor for the maker's own use, and to enact a law providing for closing liquor premises as nuisances without jury trials. The following words from the decision embrace the answer of the Court to the compensation argument:

---

[1] Besides the compensation question, the legality of closing liquor establishments by injunction proceedings was involved in the Iowa cases of 1886. It may even be true that the injunction question was a more prominent feature of these cases than the compensation question. But stress was laid on the compensation argument by Cobb's counsel, who said, in their brief:

"Now whilst by no means conceding the correctness of the decision in the Walruff case [which involved the question of compensation solely—Ed.] the distinction between that case and this is world-wide. In that case the County Attorney was proceeding to abate and shut up a $50,000 brewery as a nuisance, and to absolutely prohibit the further manufacture of beer in that establishment—thus of course destroying the business of the owner and rendering the whole property comparatively worthless. In the case at bar the appellants are sought to be enjoined from keeping a saloon in one corner of their $10,000 brewery establishment and from selling beer therein at retail—this and nothing more. No attempt is here made to arrest the operation of appellants' brewery, and the suppression of their saloon would no more interfere with the sale of beer by appellants at wholesale than the suppression of any other one of the 200 saloons . . . supplied with beer by appellants."

[2] Report of proceedings of the United States Brewers' Association, held at St. Paul, May 30 and 31, 1888.

"Keeping in view these principles as governing the relations of the judicial and legislative departments of Government with each other, it is difficult to perceive any ground for the judiciary to declare that the prohibition by Kansas of the manufacture or sale within her limits of intoxicating liquors for general use there as a beverage, is not fairly adapted to the end of protecting the community against the evils which confessedly result from the excessive use of ardent spirits. There is here no justification for holding that the State, under the guise merely of police regulations, is aiming to deprive the citizen of his Constitutional rights; for we cannot shut out of view the fact, within the knowledge of all, that the public health, the public morals and the public safety may be endangered by the general use of intoxicating drinks; nor the fact, established by statistics accessible to every one, that the disorder, pauperism and crime prevalent in the country are in some degree at least traceable to this evil. . .

"The principle that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law, was embodied, in substance, in the Constitutions of nearly all, if not all, of the several States at the time of the adoption of the 14th Amendment, and it has never been regarded as incompatible with the principle, equally vital, because essential to the peace and safety of society, that all property in this country is held under the implied obligation that the owner's use of it shall not be injurious to the community. (Beer Company v. Massachusetts, 97 U. S. 32; Commonwealth v. Alger, 7 Cush. 53.) . . .

"The question now before us arises under what are strictly the police powers of the State, exerted for the protection of the health, morals and safety of the people. . . .

"As already stated, the present case must be governed by principles that do not involve the power of eminent domain, in the exercise of which property may not be taken for public use without compensation. A prohibition simply upon the use of property for purposes that are declared, by valid legislation, to be injurious to the health, morals or safety of the community, cannot in any just sense be deemed a taking or an appropriation of property for the public benefit. Such legislation does not disturb the owner in the control or use of his property for lawful purposes, nor restrict his right to dispose of it, but is only a declaration by the State that its use by any one for certain forbidden purposes is prejudicial to the public interests. Nor can legislation of that character come within the 14th Amendment in any case, unless it is apparent that its real object is not to protect the community or to promote the general well-being, but, under the guise of police regulations, to deprive the owner of his liberty and property without due process of law.

"The power which the States unquestionably have of prohibiting such use by individuals of their property as will be prejudicial to the health, the morals or the safety of the public is not, and—consistently with the existence and safety of organized society—cannot be burdened with the condition that the State must compensate such individual owners for pecuniary losses they sustain, by reason of their not being permitted by a noxious use of their property to inflict injury upon the community. The exercise of the police power by the destruction of property which is itself a public nuisance, or the prohibition of its use in a particular way, whereby its value becomes depreciated, is very different from taking property for public use, or from depriving a person of his property without due process of law. In the one case, a nuisance only is abated; in the other, unoffending property is taken away from an innocent owner.

"It is true that when the defendants in these cases purchased or erected their breweries, the laws of the State did not forbid the manufacture of intoxicating liquors. But the State did not thereby give any assurance, or come under an obligation, that its legislation upon that subject would remain unchanged. Indeed, as was said in Stone v. Mississippi, 101 U. S., the supervision of the public health and the public morals is a governmental power, 'continuing in its nature,' and 'to be dealt with as the special exigencies of the moment may require;' and that 'for this purpose the largest legislative discretion is allowed, and the discretion cannot be parted with any more than the power itself.' So in Beer Company v. Massachusetts (97 U. S. 32): 'If the public safety or the public morals require the discontinuance of any manufacture or traffic, the hand of the Legislature cannot be stayed from providing for its discontinuance by any incidental inconvenience which individuals or corporations may suffer.'"

---

[1] Justice Field was the only Democrat sitting on the Supreme Bench at that time. He was an uncle to Judge Brewer. He had made a record as a consistent advocate of compensation. (See his opinion in the case of Bartemeyer v. Iowa, 18 Wallace, 129.) In the nephew's decision in the Walruff case, the only positive opinion from a Supreme Court Justice fully supporting his views that he was able to quote, was an opinion delivered by Justice Field.

[For the text of the decision in the Kansas cases, see 123 U. S., 623. See also "The Great Prohibition Decision; with introduction and annotations by Hon. S. W. Packard." (Funk & Wagnalls, New York, 1888.) For notable State Court decisions against the right of compensation see 69 Iowa, 401; 72 Iowa, 377, and 3 Michigan, 330.]

ENGLAND'S COMPENSATION STRUGGLE.

In England the compensation question has been warmly debated and seems to be settled in the negative. Lord Salisbury's powerful Conservative ministry, in April, 1888, introduced a Local Government bill of which an important feature was a provision for recognizing a vested interest in existing licenses by granting compensation to liquor-sellers whose applications for renewals should be refused. The plan was skilfully presented, and so unexpectedly that both the House of Commons and the country were taken by surprise. The temperance people at first manifested but little disposition to organize a determined and an aggressive opposition; it seemed idle to hope that a Government measure backed by an enormous majority in the House of Commons could be defeated by popular agitation. Some able articles written by Mr. Axel Gustafson directed popular attention to the strongest arguments against compensation. Mr. Gustafson challenged the Solicitor-General (who was the projector of the measure) to discuss vital propositions, and especially to consider precedents. This official responded, and several letters were exchanged, appearing in the columns of the Manchester *Guardian*. Mr. Gustafson showed that no Superior Court in England, in passing on refusals of licensing magistrates to renew licenses, had recognized that liquor-sellers had a vested interest in their licenses. Lord Chief-Justice Cockburn had said, in the Court of Queen's Bench, May 18, 1878: "According to the act of 1828 the Justices have the same discretion to refuse a renewal as they had to refuse granting a new license." Mr. Justice Field, in the Court of Queen's Bench, November, 1882, had said: "In every case in every year there is a new license granted. You may call it a renewal if you like, but that does not make it an old one. The Legislature does not call it a renewal. The Legislature is not capable of calling a new thing an old one. The Legislature recognizes no vested right at all in any holder of a license. It does not treat the interest as a vested one in any way." And Baron Pollock had said in the Court of Queen's Bench, Jan. 31, 1884: "The notion that there is a property of the landlord in a license cannot be considered as sound law." In fact, while the agitation upon the Local Government bill was pending (April 30, 1888) Lord Field and Mr. Justice Mills decided, in an appeal case, that the possession of licenses established no vested rights. The recognition of the unsoundness of the compensation argument was so well founded in English jurisprudence that Mr. Nash, barrister-at-law and counsel to the Licensed Victuallers' Association, had said: "Now, I am sorry to say, having looked into this question most exhaustively, and having compared notes with my brethren well versed in these matters, that there cannot be the smallest doubt that in the strict sense no such thing as a vested interest exists. . . The mere mention of the term 'vested interest' should be avoided, as it infuriates every Court, from the Queen's Bench downwards."[1] The popular opposition to the bill grew rapidly and the United Kingdom Alliance and other temperance organizations (at first reluctant or despairing) were persuaded to fight it with their whole strength. A magnificent and wonderfully enthusiastic meeting in the Manchester Free Trade Hall, presided over by Sir Henry Roscoe, aroused the country. It was followed by other great gatherings, and the agitation culminated in an extraordinary demonstration in Hyde Park, London, on June 2. The strength of the opposition was so formidable that in two bye-elections for Members of Parliament the Government was defeated on the compensation issue, a Conservative majority of 668 at Southampton being changed to a Liberal majority of 885, and a Government majority of 1,175 at Ayr Boroughs giving way to an adverse majority of 63. The remarkable showing of popular indignation caused the Government to withdraw the compensation clauses unconditionally.

But in the spring of 1890 the scheme

---

[1] These different quotations are taken from Cardinal Manning's article "Compensation," in the *Contemporary Review* for June, 1890.

was revived by the Salisbury Ministry. A bill drawn even more cunningly than the one presented in 1888 was introduced in the House of Commons and passed on second reading by a majority of 73 (May 19).

It was pretended that the real object of the bill was to reduce the number of licenses and thereby "promote temperance." Mr. Goschen, Chancellor of the Exchequer, in an imposing speech analyzing the budget figures, had shown that the Government revenues from the drink traffic were increasing at an enormous rate, and that of a surplus revenue of £3,200,000, £1,800,000 was due to the increase from liquor sources. The Conservative statesmen professed great concern at this state of affairs, indicating as it did (in their judgment) an alarming growth of intemperance among the people. Therefore they announced their intention, as self-styled friends of temperance, to bring about a diminution in the number of public houses (particularly in the number of beer-shops) and to forbid the issuing of additional licenses. It was strenuously and arrogantly claimed that these were the fundamental objects of the bill, and that the whole measure was therefore a temperance measure. But it was further provided that the owners of all licenses extinguished by the terms of the bill should be granted compensation from the public funds for their losses; and the sum of £440,000 was set apart from the liquor revenue, to be distributed *pro rata* to the various counties, and applied for buying out licensees. The Conservative leaders and their newspaper organs claimed that this provision for compensation, besides being equitable, was thoroughly unobjectionable, because the whole of the money used for compensating liquor-sellers would be drawn from the liquor revenue. Mr. Ritchie, in setting forth the merits of the bill in the House of Commons (May 12), made this curious plea: "It must be remembered, whether our purposes be good or bad, our details right or wrong, this money is raised from drink for the purpose of diminishing the sale of drink." The temperance people who fought the measure were savagely denounced, notably by the London *Times*, as "intemperate temperance fanatics," bent on a policy of "spoliation" and chargeable with responsibility for resisting a wise and practical plan for reducing the drink traffic.

Temperance opposition was instantaneous. Mr. Gladstone and the Liberals were quick to espouse the anti-compensation cause in the House of Commons. The real purposes of the Conservatives were exposed in many striking speeches. "No valid precedent for compensating publicans can be brought forward, and, therefore, the Government is endeavoring to make a precedent," said W. S. Caine, M. P. "If compensation is once established," he added, "the difficulties of the temperance people will be increased tenfold, and a solid wall of 200,000,000 sovereigns will be built across a path which is now clear and unobstructed."[1] Mr. Caine in very effective language called attention to the hollow mockery of the Government's claim that its desire was to reduce the number of liquor licenses. For example, the amount of money to be applied in London for closing public houses by purchase would be, under the provisions of the bill, only £60,000; and Mr. Caine had ascertained by conclusive inquiries that the lowest average valuation of public houses in London entitled to sell liquor for consumption on the premises was about £5,000; so that the Government's bill, if enacted, would extinguish only 12 drinking-places in the entire city of London. Mr. Gladstone and others fittingly characterized the bill as one for the "endowment" of drink-traffickers. Mr. Gladstone showed that if the bill should become a law the value of every public house would immediately be materially enhanced. In a speech in the House of Commons (May 22), answering the Tory claim that the real purpose was to reduce the number of drink-shops, he used these striking words: "The diminution in the number will not entail a corresponding diminution in the drink traffic. The business of the remaining houses will be increased [Hear, hear], and it will be enlarged to the full extent of the apparent numerical diminution of the houses. [Hear, hear.]" In conclusion he spoke impressively of the disastrous influence that compensation would have upon the progress of the temperance reform, saying that it would "throw back for, perhaps, an indefinite period, the cause whose progress we have observed and registered from day to day, and in the great future triumph of which we have undoubting confidence. [Loud cheers.]"

---

[1] It was estimated that £200,000,000 was the amount of capital invested in the liquor traffic in Great Britain.

The result of the second effort of the Salisbury Government to force compensation upon Great Britain was even more instructive than that of the first. The meetings of the opposition were, if possible, more numerous and enthusiastic. There was a demonstration in Hyde Park on June 7 which outdid the great gathering of 1888. But the Government clung to the measure with stubborn tenacity, realizing, no doubt, that this was its last opportunity for enacting compensation provisions and thereby winning the permanent, solid and devoted support of the liquor interests for the Tory party. Although the bill had a majority of 73 on second reading, the real struggle came when Parliament considered it in Committee of the Whole. In this struggle the advantage was wholly with the opposition. The Government's majority of 73 dwindled to 32 upon an important motion made at the beginning of June; and on June 20 the compensation clause was carried by a majority of only 4 votes. A few days later it was withdrawn absolutely.

Congo, Rum on the.—See Index.

Congregational Church.—The following resolutions were passed by its highest representative body, assembled in Boston, Mass., October, 1889:

"RESOLVED, That the National Council of Congregational Churches hereby declares its unqualified condemnation of this evil of intemperance, and its sympathy with legitimate efforts for its removal; that it commends to churches and all Christian workers the use of wise measures to secure as far as possible the universal personal abstinence from all intoxicating drinks as a beverage.

"RESOLVED, That this Council commends the employment of suitable means and methods to promote the education of the young in the principles of temperance, and in a knowledge of the evils of the use of intoxicants; and that it expresses its sympathy with the Christian women of our land in their efforts to secure the teaching necessary to attain this end, and to provide for the purity of the home and the suppression of the evils of intemperance.

"RESOLVED, That the saloon is so great a menace to the peace of society, to the good order and welfare of the communities in which it exists, and so great a hindrance to the advance of the cause of our divine Master, as to demand the employment of the wisest and most efficient legitimate means for its removal; and that we call upon our churches and other bodies of Christians to unite in prayer to God for wisdom and divine guidance in efforts for removing this great evil."

Congress.—See UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Congressional Temperance Society.—On the 26th of February, 1833, at a meeting in the Senate Chamber, under a call signed by 25 members of Congress, a Congressional Temperance Society was formed. The constitution for the Society, presented by Theodore Frelinghuysen, was unanimously adopted. The object of the Society as stated in the preamble to the constitution was, "by example and kind moral influence to discountenance the use of ardent spirits and the traffic in it throughout the community." Lewis Cass, then Secretary of War, who had the year before issued an order prohibiting the introduction of ardent spirits into any fort, camp or garrison of the United States, was made the first President of the Society, with the Secretary of the Senate as its Secretary. There were nine Vice-Presidents, an Executive Committee and about one hundred members. It was found that the pledge against ardent spirits did not prevent the fall of those in the Society whom it was designed to help. In 1842 the Society was reorganized on the basis of abstinence from all intoxicating drink, with George N. Briggs as President and nine eminent men as Vice-Presidents from as many different States. At the next public meeting after the Society was reorganized on the basis of total abstinence, Thomas Marshall began his speech with the words: "Mr. President: The old Congressional Temperance Society has died of intemperance, holding the pledge in one hand and the champagne bottle in the other." The changes in the membership of the Society by reason of the changes of members of Congress modified the interest in its maintenance and work. There were periods of which there are no records that anything was done; and sometimes great vigor was manifest in the holding of public meetings, especially at the anniversaries. A notable period of activity followed the revival of the Society in 1867, with Schuyler Colfax and Henry Wilson prominent in the movement. The influence of this Society has extended widely over the land, and at times has attracted attention in other countries.

HENRY WARD.

Connecticut.—See Index.

Constitutional Prohibition,[1] or Prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors of every kind for beverage purposes by direct mandate of Federal and State Constitutional law—the goal of the present radical movement against the liquor traffic in the United States. The fundamental power of the Federal Government and of each State Government being defined by a written Constitution, which is the permanent fountain of all statutory legislation, which under our institutions can never be abolished save to give way to another written instrument of equal dignity, and which cannot be changed or amended in any detail without mature deliberation and the observance of carefully prescribed forms, it follows that the Prohibition of the drink traffic, if provided for by Constitutional enactment, will be in the highest attainable degree authoritative, effective and enduring.

ADVANTAGES OVER STATUTORY PROHIBITION AND LOCAL OPTION.

The fatal imperfections of all other forms of Prohibitory legislation have been made manifest by varied experience. It is always within the power of the Legislature to enact a rigid Prohibitory statute, whether the Constitution commands it to do so or not; and a Legislature may, at will, prohibit the manufacture and sale of liquor absolutely, over the entire territory under its jurisdiction, even though the Constitution is silent. But statutory legislation is by its nature unstable and ephemeral because partisan or tentative; the life of a Legislature in the United States never exceeds two years, and in many States the Legislature has but a single session. Though a Prohibitory act of the most satisfactory character may be carried by a great majority through a given Legislature, there is no assurance, so long as the Constitution makes no explicit direction, that it will be retained on the statute-books for a period long enough to admit of a fair trial: the very next Legislature, meeting at the end of a year or at the utmost of two years, is then at liberty to repeal it. Political vicissitudes, popular caprice, the influence of systematic bribery and corruption, the violent opposition of a venal or prejudiced press, the interference of partisan managers or the organized liquor power of other States, may cause an abrupt change of legislative attitude on the Prohibition question and bring about repeal of the act before it has been tested at all, or may accomplish the destruction of a beneficient law while at the height of its usefulness. Of the many States passing Prohibitory statutes before the Civil War, only four (Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and Iowa) have permitted them to survive until the present day; in most cases the Legislatures rescinded these statutes before five years had expired and in some cases within one year or two years; in other instances, where the laws were allowed to remain nominally in force until after the war, they were promptly wiped out by the Legislature when their enforcement or improvement was seriously proposed; discriminations in favor of the manufacture were made in several of the early statutes, as originally enacted or as amended; some of them exempted (or were soon amended so as to exempt) wine, beer and cider—in fact, many of the conditions that must be heeded if Prohibitory laws are to be genuine were ignored or evaded. With Prohibition clauses in the Constitutions of those States, the necessity of enacting better statutes could not have been escaped by the Legislatures, and it would have been impossible to repeal them without first annulling the Constitutional requirements by direct vote of the people.

The distinguishing virtue of Constitutional Prohibition lies in the necessary existence behind it of a majority of the whole popular vote, and a very large majority of the votes of the best citizens. No Constitution or Constitutional Amendment can be adopted in any State unless a majority of the people voting on the question, at the ballot-box, shall approve. It follows that the presence of a Prohibitory article in any Constitution implies a direct decree of the people that there shall be radical Prohibitory law, a decree that, considering the peculiar difficulties in the way of amending Constitutions, is looked upon as well-nigh irreversible. It is true some of the old Prohibitory statutes were passed in obedience to affirmative votes of the people on the question, Shall the Legislature enact the Maine law? But these affirmative votes had the significance of mere plebiscites rather than of responsible majorities; they did not prescribe the scope of the Prohibition or direct that it should include the manufacture, and there was no power by which they could he made binding.

---

[1] The Nebraska Constitutional Prohibition campaign is the subject of a special article. (See pp. 443-50.)

In a still wider and more important sense Constitutional Prohibition is superior to Local Option. A Local Option act, like a comprehensive Prohibitory statute unsustained by a Constitutional article, has no assured vitality but may be overthrown with comparative ease by the liquor power or hostile politicians; the repeal of the Local Option laws of Pennsylvania and New Jersey after many counties in each State had voted for Prohibition illustrates the instability of such measures. Besides, Local Option legislation seldom bestows on the people the privilege of interfering with the manufacture of liquor, and does not frequently provide suitable penalties for illicit sales by druggists and others. Again, though a county may vote for Prohibition with practical unanimity, the neighboring counties of the same State may refuse to disturb the rumsellers within their borders, and these licensed dealers may, by infringing the laws of the Prohibitory county, neutralize its good effects. But the chief disadvantage of the Local Option method is in its total failure in the communities where the liquor evil is greatest. Underlying the theory and policy of Prohibition is the claim, honored by observance almost everywhere in the United States and thoroughly established by judicial decisions, that because of the admitted dangers of the drink traffic it may rightfully be prohibited in any locality by a majority vote regardless of the wishes of the minority, or in every locality of a whole State by the will of a Constitutional majority of the voters or legislators of that State regardless of the powerful protests of particular localities. If Prohibitory legislation involves arbitrary and seemingly despotic interference with the prevailing sentiment of particular constituencies, this interference is nevertheless justified when associated constituencies, comprised in the same political unit, declare by a preponderance of sentiment that the interests of the whole people demand Prohibitory law for all. With the soundness of this principle recognized (and practical recognition of it is inseparable from acceptance of the Local Option idea), the opponents of the liquor traffic need not hesitate to invoke a policy whereby the strongholds of their enemy may be subdued. Any advanced form of Prohibition is, indeed, merely an extension of the Local Option privilege; and State and National Prohibition, secured by Constitutional Amendments ratified by the people, would be but the logical outcome of the earliest and most limited Local Option victory.

EARLY DEVELOPMENTS.

The great advantage of incorporating the Prohibition principle in State Constitutions was recognized, though imperfectly, as early as 1850, when, upon the adoption of the present Constitution of Michigan, the following clause was inserted in that instrument by a vote of 36,149 to 9,433:

> "The Legislature shall not pass any act authorizing the grant of license for the sale of ardent spirits or other intoxicating liquors."

And in 1851 an "additional section" was added to the new Constitution of Ohio by a separate vote of the people, the majority being in excess of 10,000. This "additional section" was:

> "No license to traffic in intoxicating liquors shall hereafter be granted in this State, but the General Assembly may by law provide against evils resulting therefrom."

But both the Ohio and Michigan Constitutional provisions simply interdicted license—they did not direct the enactment of Prohibitory laws. Practically, these interdictions were of little advantage to the temperance cause. Although both Ohio and Michigan passed Prohibitory statutes before the war, the measures so granted were weak and did not survive. Ohio's related only to consumption on the premises, and Michigan's, modified so as to exempt beer and wine, was rescinded in 1875. Meanwhile the Anti-License articles of the Constitutions were found to be absolutely worthless: Ohio's has endured until this day, but its intent has been circumvented by the passage of ingenious so-called "tax" laws; while in Michigan, after the State Supreme Court (October, 1875) had decided that a "tax" law enacted by the Legislature was valid notwithstanding the Constitutional Anti-License clause, the people, in November, 1876, consented to the elimination of this clause from the Constitution by a majority of 8,078 in a total of 113,200.[1]

It was not until 1856 that the Constitutional Prohibition idea as now understood was definitely broached, and then the necessity of including the manufacture as well as the sale of liquors seems not to have been perceived. In that year William H. Armstrong, Grand Worthy Patriarch of the Grand Division of Sons of Temperance of Eastern New York, proposed and discussed the plan. In 1857 he secured a unanimous endorsement from the Grand Division, which was renewed at three subsequent sessions. Mr. Armstrong printed in the New York *Witness* for May 29, 1858, a very thorough article defining the new programme, suggesting that an Amendment worded as follows be added to the Constitution of the State of New York:

> "The sale of intoxicating liquors shall not be licensed or allowed in this State excepting for chemical, medicinal or manufacturing purposes, and then only under restrictive regulations to be made by the Legislature. It shall be the duty of the Legislature to prescribe proper penalties for the sale of liquors in violation of this provision, such liquors being hereby declared a *common nuisance*, and liable to confiscation."

Although some temperance organizations joined with the Sons of Temperance of Eastern New York in favoring Constitutional Prohibition, no practical steps were taken until the legislative session of 1860, when the following joint resolution was introduced into the New York Senate (see the New York *Tribune* for April 9, 1860):

> "RESOLVED (if the Assembly concur), That the Constitution of the State be amended as follows:
>
> "'The sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage is hereby prohibited, and no law shall be enacted or be in force after the adoption of this Amendment to authorize such sale, and the Legislature shall by law prescribe the necessary fines and penalties for any violation of this provision.'
>
> "RESOLVED (if the Assembly concur), That the foregoing Amendment be referred to the Legislature, to be chosen at the general election of Senators, and that, in conformity to Section 1 of Article 13 of the Constitution, it be published for three months previous to the time of such election."

The Senate approved this joint resolution on the 13th of March, 1860, by a vote of 30 yeas (29 Republicans and one Democrat) to 6 nays (all Democrats), and the Assembly concurred on April 5, 1861, by 69 yeas to 33 nays. The indorsement of the next Legislature was required before the proposed Amendment could go to the people; but the exciting events of the Civil War caused the abandonment of the plan.[2]

BEGINNING OF THE AGITATION.

A period of 17 years expired before the next notable demand for Constitutional Prohibition was urged. It is somewhat difficult to determine who is entitled to the credit of first giving practical form to the movement which began to make a stir among the temperance people of Iowa and Kansas in 1878. Mr. B. F. Wright of Charles City, Ia., lays claim to the honor. In August, 1878 (according to his statement), he suggested the Constitutional Prohibition method to Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, who was then conducting a district session of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Charles City. "Mrs. Foster" — we quote from Mr. Wright—"did not at first take kindly to the suggestion; but before the State meeting of the Iowa W. C. T. U., in Burlington, in December of 1888, she wrote to me saying she had decided that work for a Constitutional Amendment was the best thing to be done, and asking if any special suggestions were to be made for introducing the plan to the public. I answered this letter in an article published in the *Floyd County Advocate*, Sept. 7, 1878, setting forth my views at length.

---

[1] A new Constitution was submitted to the people of Michigan for ratification or rejection in 1869, and at the same time the question whether the Anti-License clause should be retained or eliminated was separately submitted. The temperance people then desired the retention of anti-license in the Constitution, and united their efforts for defeating the new Constitution. The majority against the new Constitution was 38,749 in a total of 182,315, and there was a majority of 13,681 against eliminating the Anti-License clause in a total of 158,605. This record of 1869, made before it was known that a tax law could be legally framed in spite of the Constitutional anti-license provision, had much the same moral significance that a direct vote for Prohibition would have had.

[2] For the facts about the early movement for Constitutional Prohibition the editor is indebted to John N. Stearns of the National Temperance Society.

Mrs. Foster, as Chairman of the Legislative Committee of the W. C. T. U., elaborated these views in a very able report that she made to the State W. C. T. U. Convention, giving due credit 'to a friend living in Floyd County.'" But it is certain that in Kansas at about the same time the idea was definitely considered and acted on. At the session of the Kansas State Grand Lodge of Good Templars, held at Fort Scott in October, 1878 (according to Amanda M. Way, late G. C. T. of the Good Templars of Kansas), a committee was appointed to prepare a petition to the Legislature asking for an Amendment to the Constitution forever prohibiting the manufacture, sale and importation of alcoholic liquors, and also for a Prohibitory law to take effect at once. Petitions were prepared, circulated for signatures and submitted to the Legislature at Topeka by the officers of the Grand Lodge.

The Amendment method was not at first approved by all the friends of Prohibition in Kansas and Iowa. The Kansas people felt stronger interest in the fate of their bill for statutory Prohibition; and it is a fact that the joint resolution submitting a Prohibitory Constitutional Amendment to the people was brought to the front and passed by the Kansas Legislature of 1879 as a political device for defeating the Prohibitory bill and other restrictive measures, the politicians believing that so radical a proposition as that for a Constitutional Amendment against the manufacture and sale of liquors would never be approved by a majority of the popular vote. In Iowa the old Prohibitory statute was still in force in 1878, but it was practically a dead letter because of the exemption of wine and beer; and the Iowa temperance people considered it more desirable to labor for a perfected statute than to press the apparently hopeless demand for Constitutional Prohibition. In February, 1879, a State meeting of Reform Clubs was held at Waterloo, Ia., and Mr. B. F. Wright earnestly advocated his Constitutional Prohibition scheme; but the differences of opinion were so marked that the Committee on Resolutions of that body, after hours of exciting debate, brought in a conservative report recommending moral suasion and statutory and Constitutional Prohibition.

EARLY SUCCESSES.

When, however, the issue for and against Constitutional Prohibition was definitely presented by legislative action, the temperance people quickly understood that a rare opportunity was before them. By concentrating their resources, arousing moral enthusiasm and diligently presenting the claims for their policy, they might win a whole State at a single blow, and the victory would be of no uncertain nature. The result of the first campaign, made in Kansas in 1880, fully confirmed the most sanguine hopes; by a majority of nearly 8,000 the following Constitutional Amendment was adopted:

"The manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors shall be forever prohibited in the State, except for medicinal, scientific and mechanical purposes."

A more substantial victory followed in Iowa in 1882, the majority reaching nearly 30,000, and the text of the Amendment being as follows:

"Section 26.—No person shall manufacture for sale, sell, or keep for sale as a beverage any intoxicating liquors whatever, including ale, wine and beer. The General Assembly shall, by law, prescribe regulations for the enforcement of the provisions herein contained, and shall thereby provide suitable penalties for violations of the provisions thereof."

These two great triumphs aroused remarkable interest throughout the country. Constitutional Prohibition became the accepted policy of advanced temperance workers everywhere in the North. Republican and Democratic Conventions in the different States were besought to pledge submission of Amendments. Legislatures were petitioned and every available means of persuasion was used. The striking result of the Ohio campaign of 1883 seemed to emphasize the conviction that Constitutional Prohibition was destined to sweep the country. That great State, which had persistently nullified the Anti-License article of the Constitution of 1851, and which was dominated politically by the German influence, gave a majority of more than 82,000 for the following proposed Amendment:

"The manufacture of and the traffic in intoxicating liquors to be used as a beverage are forever prohibited; and the General Assembly shall provide by law for the enforcement of this provision,"

while at the same time an alternative

Amendment providing that "The General Assembly shall regulate the traffic in intoxicating liquors so as to provide against evils resulting therefrom, and its power to levy taxes or assessments thereon is not limited by any provisions of the Constitution," was voted down by more than 92,000. Although the Ohio Prohibitionists were robbed by technicalities of the fruits of their victory, the moral effect was most impressive. Confidence was still further strengthened by the sweeping result in Maine in 1884, the following Amendment being added to the Constitution of that State by a vote of three to one:

> "The manufacture of intoxicating liquors, not including cider, and the sale and keeping for sale of intoxicating liquors, are and shall be forever prohibited. Except, however, that the sale and keeping for sale of such liquors for medicinal and mechanical purposes and the arts, and the sale and keeping for sale of cider may be permitted under such regulations as the Legislature may provide. The Legislature shall enact laws with suitable penalties for the suppression of the manufacture, sale and keeping for sale of intoxicating liquors, with the exceptions herein specified."

Again in 1885 the wisdom of the advocates of Constitutional Prohibition was vindicated. In that part of the Territory of Dakota that has since become the State of South Dakota, a Constitutional Convention framed a Constitution that was to become operative upon the admission of South Dakota into the Union, and the following proposed article was submitted to the people separately and ratified by a majority of about 200:

> "ARTICLE 24.—No person or corporation shall manufacture or aid in the manufacture of for sale, any intoxicating liquor; no person shall sell or keep for sale as a beverage any intoxicating liquor. The Legislature shall by law prescribe regulations for the enforcement of the provisions of this section and provide suitable and adequate penalties for the violation thereof."

In the next year (1886) a triumph more gratifying, perhaps, than any that had yet been scored was witnessed in the conservative manufacturing State of Rhode Island, which decreed, by more than a three-fifths vote, that

> "The manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors to be used as a beverage shall be prohibited. The General Assembly shall provide for carrying this article into effect."

A LONG SERIES OF DEFEATS.

Thus in seven years five States and one prospective State had approved the principle of Constitutional Prohibition by popular majorities. In this period no State had recorded a majority against a genuine Prohibitory Amendment, although North Carolina, in 1881, had voted down by more than 116,000 majority a so-called Amendment that was wholly unsatisfactory to the temperance people. It was naturally believed by most friends of the cause that the movement was showing itself to be irresistible. But a long series of defeats now ensued. Before inquiring more particularly into causes and circumstances, we will present the texts of the Amendments voted on in the different States since the Rhode Island election of 1886, and indicate the results.

Michigan, 1887, defeated by 5,645: "ARTICLE 4, SECTION 49.—The manufacture, gift or sale of spirituous, malt or vinous liquors in this State, except for medicinal, mechanical, chemical or scientific purposes, is prohibited: and no property right in such spirituous, malt or vinous liquors shall be deemed to exist, except the right to manufacture or sell for medicinal, mechanical, chemical or scientific purposes under such restrictions and regulations as may be provided by law. The Legislature shall enact laws with suitable penalties for the suppression of the manufacture, sale and keeping for sale or gift of intoxicating liquors, except as herein specified."

Texas, 1887, defeated by 91,357: "SECTION 20.—The manufacture, sale and exchange of intoxicating liquors, except for medical, mechanical, sacramental and scientific purposes, is hereby prohibited in the State of Texas. The Legislature shall, at the first session held after the adoption of this Amendment, enact necessary laws to put this provision into effect."

Tennessee, 1887, defeated by 27,693: "No person shall manufacture for sale, or sell, or keep for sale as a beverage, any intoxicating liquors whatever, including wine, ale and beer. The General Assembly shall by law prescribe regulations for the enforcement of the prohibition herein contained and shall thereby provide suitable penalties for the violation of the provisions hereof."

Oregon, 1887, defeated by 7,985: "SECTION 1.—The manufacture, sale or giving away, or the offering to sell or give away, or the keeping for sale of any spirituous, vinous, malt, distilled, fermented, or any intoxicating liquor, is prohibited in this State, except for medicinal, scientific or mechanical purposes.

"SEC. 2.—The Legislative Assembly shall prescribe by law in what manner and by whom and at what places, such liquors, or any of them, shall be manufactured or sold, or kept for sale for medicinal, scientific or mechanical purposes.

"SEC. 3.—This Amendment shall take effect and be in full force in six months from the date of its ratification by the electors.

"Sec. 4.—The Legislative Assembly shall without delay pass all necessary laws with sufficient penalties necessary to enforce this Amendment."

West Virginia, 1888, defeated by 34,887: "The manufacture, sale and keeping for sale of all intoxicating liquors, drinks, mixtures and preparations, except as hereinafter provided, are forever prohibited within this State; and the Legislature shall without delay provide by appropriate legislation for the strict enforcement of this provision. But the Legislature may provide by law for the manufacture, sale and keeping for sale of alcohol and preparations thereof, for scientific, mechanical and medicinal purposes, and of wine for sacramental purposes, under sufficient penalties and securities to insure the due execution of such laws as may be enacted under this section."

New Hampshire, 1889, defeated by 5,190: "That the sale or keeping for sale, or manufacture of alcoholic or intoxicating liquors, except cider, or any compound of which such liquor is a part, to be used as a beverage, is a misdemeanor and is hereby prohibited."

Massachusetts, 1889, defeated by 46 626: "The manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors to be used as a beverage are prohibited. The General Court shall enact suitable legislation to enforce the provisions of this article."

Pennsylvania, 1889, defeated by 188,027: "Article 19.—The manufacture, sale or keeping for sale of intoxicating liquor to be used as a beverage is hereby prohibited, and any violation of this prohibition shall be a misdemeanor, punishable as shall be provided by law. The manufacture, sale or keeping for sale of intoxicating liquor for other purposes than as a beverage may be allowed in such manner only as may be prescribed by law. The General Assembly shall, at the first session succeeding the adoption of this Article of the Constitution, enact laws with adequate penalties for its enforcement."

Rhode Island, 1889, repealed the Prohibitory Amendment of 1886 by 18,315 majority.

South Dakota, 1889, adopted by 6,053: "Article 24.—No person or corporation shall manufacture or aid in the manufacture of for sale, any intoxicating liquor; no person shall sell or keep for sale as a beverage any intoxicating liquor. The Legislature shall, by law prescribe regulations for the enforcement of the provisions of this section and provide suitable and adequate penalties for the violation thereof."

North Dakota, 1889, adopted by 1,159: "Article 20.—No person, association or corporation shall within this State manufacture for sale or gift any intoxicating liquors, and no person, association or corporation shall import any of the same for sale or gift, or keep or sell or offer the same for sale or gift, barter or trade as a beverage. The Legislative Assembly shall by law prescribe regulations for the enforcement of the provisions of this Article and shall thereby provide suitable penalties for the violation thereof."

Washington, 1889, defeated by 11,943: "Separate Article No. 2—It shall not be lawful for any individual, company or corporation, within the limits of this State, to manufacture or cause to be manufactured, or to sell or offer for sale, or in any manner dispose of any alcoholic, malt or spirituous liquors, except for medicinal, sacramental or scientific purposes."

Connecticut, 1889, defeated by 27,595: "The manufacture or compounding of and sale or keeping for sale of intoxicating liquors, except for sacramental, medicinal, scientific, mechanical or art purposes, shall be and hereby are prohibited in this State; and it shall be the duty of the Legislature to pass laws for the enforcement of this article."

RECAPITULATION AND GENERAL REVIEW.

The following table summarizes the main statistical facts in connection with Constitutional Prohibition struggles in the various States:

Year.	State.	Date of Election.	Party submitting question to people.	Vote.		Whole vote at nearest important political election.	Number not voting on Constitutional Prohibition.
				For Prohibition.	Against Prohibition.		
1880	Kansas	Nov. 2, (Presidential election)	Rep	91,874	84,037	201,236 (Pres., '80)	25,325
1882	Iowa	June 27, (Special election)	Rep	155,436	125,677	292,048 (Sec'y, '82)	10,935
1883	Ohio	Oct. 14, (State election)	Rep	323,189	240,975	721,310 (Gov., '83)	157,146
1884	Maine	Sept. 8, (State election)	Rep	70,783	23,811	142,413 (Gov., '84)	47,819
1885	South Dakota[1]	Nov. 3, (Constitution election)	Rep	15,570	15,337	86,768 (Cong., '84)	55,861
1886	Rhode Island	April 7, (State election)	Rep	15,113	9,230	26,875 (Gov., '86)	2,532
1887	Michigan	April 4, (State election)	Rep	178,636	184,281	380,885 (Gov., '86)	17,968
	Texas	Aug. 4, (Special election)	Dem	129,270	220,627	357,513 (Pres., '88)	7,616
	Tennessee	Sept. 29, (Special election)	Dem.	117,504	145,197	303,784 (Pres., '88)	41,083
	Oregon	Nov. 8, (Special election)	Rep. & Dem	19,973	27,958	54,954 (Cong., '86)	7,023
1888	West Virginia	Nov. 6, (Presidential election)	Dem. & Rep	41,668	76,555	159,540 (Pres., '88)	41,317
1889	New Hampshire	March 12, (Town elections)	Rep	25,786	30,976	90,922 (Pres., '88)	34,160
	Massachusetts	April 22, (Special election)	Rep	85,242	131,062	344,517 (Pres., '88)	128,213
	Pennsylvania	June 18, (Special election)	Rep	296,617	484,644	997,568 (Pres., '88)	216,307
	Rhode Island	June 20, (Special election)	Rep	9,956	28,315	43,111 (Gov., '89)	4,840
	South Dakota	Oct. 1, (State election)	Rep	39,509	33,456	77,827 (Gov., '89)	4,862
	North Dakota	Oct. 1, (State election)	Rep	18,552	17,393	38,098 (Gov., '89)	2,153
	Washington	Oct. 1, (State election)	Rep	19,546	31,489	58,443 (Gov., '89)	7,408
	Connecticut	Oct. 7, (Town elections)	Rep. & Dem	22.379	49,974	153,978 (Pres., '88)	81,625
		Totals		1,676,603	1,960,994	4,531,790	894,193

[1] Territory.

To minutely review all the significant features of these contests, many pages in excess of the space that can reasonably be allotted in this volume would be required; but since these were the great representative struggles for establishing the principle of Prohibition it is proper to consider the main facts with some degree of care.

The remarkable contrast between the results of the earlier and those of the later campaigns is first to be explained. While all the States voting on Constitutional Prohibition previously to 1887 (if North Carolina be excepted, as it should be) gave favorable majorities aggregating 172,898, 11 of the 13 States voting in the years 1887, 1888 and 1889 showed adverse majorities, and the total anti-Prohibition majority in these 13 States was 457,289. By the superficial observer this change may be attributed to a radical, conclusive and permanent reaction of public sentiment against Constitutional Prohibition; but no intelligent person will make such an interpretation without impartially studying the conditions. In truth there was no such reaction if by that term is implied a reaction occasioned by dispassionate judgment and deliberate pondering of truthful evidence and genuine argument. There was certainly an unmistakable reaction, not, however, of matured and well-informed public sentiment and therefore not necessarily conclusive or permanent.

In the first place, dismissing for the present all the explanatory circumstances and examining the figures by themselves, it is seen that in the 11 States giving hostile majorities there was a very large element of qualified voters that took no part in the elections on the issue of Constitutional Prohibition. The number of abstainers in each State (estimated on the basis of the returns for the nearest political election at which a tolerably full vote was polled) is set down in the last column of the above table. For example, in the State of Massachusetts there were 85,242 votes for Constitutional Prohibition and 131,062 votes against it, an apparent adverse majority of 45,820; but at the Presidential election of 1888 the whole vote polled in Massachusetts was 344,517, or 128,213 more than the whole vote polled on the question of Constitutional Prohibition in 1889; hence the anti-Prohibitionists really lacked 41,197 of an actual majority of the voting population of Massachusetts. The following summary presents more clearly this qualifying phase of the anti-Prohibition majorities:

STATE.	PROHIBITION.		Apparent No majority.	Qualified voters not voting on question.	Anti-Prohib. short of or in excess of actual majority.
	Yes.	No.			
Michigan...	178,636	184,281	5,645	17,968	— 6,162
Texas	129,270	220,627	91,357	7,616	+41,870
Tennessee..	117,504	145,197	27,693	41,083	— 6,696
Oregon.....	19,973	27,958	7,985	7,023	+ 480
W.Virginia.	41,668	76,555	34,887	41,317	— 3,216
New Hamp.	25,786	30,976	5,190	34,160	—14,486
Mass	85,242	131,062	45,820	128,213	—41,197
Penn.......	296,617	484,644	188,027	216,307	—14,141
Rhode I'd..	9,956	28,315	18,359	4,840	+ 6,759
Washington	19,546	31,489	11,943	7,408	+ 2,267
Conn.......	22,379	49,974	27,595	81,625	—27,016
Totals	946,577	1,411,078	464,501	587,560	—61,530

Taking the footings of this table and attaching the totals for the seven States that gave Prohibition majorities (omitting the South Dakota vote of 1885) we have the following results:

	PROHIBITION.		Apparent majority.	Qualified voters not voting on question.	Anti-Prohibitionists short of an actual majority.
	Yes.	No.			
Eleven anti-Prohibition States........	946,577	1,411,078	464,501N	587,560	61,530
Seven Prohibition States (including R. I. vote of 1886).......	730,026	549,916	180,110Y	306,663	243,387
Totals	1,676,603	1,960,994	284.391N	894,193	304,902

These figures demonstrate the erroneousness of the belief that the people, by conclusive majority votes, have repudiated Constitutional Prohibition. Even in States where the apparent majorities against the policy were overwhelming there was a very large reserve force which took no part in the elections and which must therefore be counted as neutral. No considerable part of this neutral element, at least in the hotly-contested struggles of 1887–9, can reasonably be supposed to have been inclined against Prohibition; for in these struggles it was understood that the existence of the liquor traffic of the nation was at stake, and also that the possibility of testing High License and other alternative measures (believed by a great many citizens to be preferable to Prohibition) depended wholly upon defeating the Constitutional Amendments. Influences of extraordinary potency combined to bring to the polls every opponent of Prohibitory legislation, to win to the anti-Prohibition side every hesitating voter, to confuse the minds of the Prohibitionists themselves and to fill the camp of the neutrals with backsliding Prohibition sympathizers.

Of these influences the most important were:

1. The concentration, in each State contested since 1886, of the energies and resources of the thoroughly alarmed, powerfully organized and enormously wealthy liquor interest. Previously to 1887 the "trade" was not especially active in the Constitutional Prohibition fights. But after the result in Rhode Island in the spring of 1886, the National Protective Association of distillers and wholesale rumsellers was formed, for the sole purpose of defeating Prohibition. From that time forward the liquor traffic of the nation at large made the anti-Prohibition cause in each State its own, immense sums of money were raised to defeat the Amendments, and the campaigns were managed with the utmost shrewdness and unscrupulousness.

2. The diligent agitation of High License and Local Option, in order to satisfy conservative temperance people and woo them from their inclination to favor Prohibition.

3. The artful opposition of the most influential political leaders and the use of the machinery of both the old political parties.

4. The hostility of well-nigh every important daily newspaper and the consequent suppression or perversion by the representative public journals of Prohibition argument and evidence.

5. The employment by the anti-Prohibitionists of the most unfair methods of warfare. Newspapers were deliberately purchased outright; false statistics, scandalously dishonest statistical deductions, "manufactured" news dispatches and misleading and meretricious appeals of all sorts constituted their stock of campaign material. Ridicule, intimidation, outrages, violence and fraud contributed to the anti-Prohibition majorities in all the States.

Having considered in a comprehensive way the chief general facts, we may now, as briefly as possible in justice to the importance and interest of the campaigns, present the main particulars for the separate State contests.

CAMPAIGNS OF 1880–6.

Kansas. [1]

As already stated, the submission of the Prohibitory Amendment in this State was granted by the politicians as a compromise, the Legislature not being willing to pass the Prohibitory statute demanded by the temperance people, but readily consenting to the plan of referring the question to the people. The submission bill was introduced in the Senate on Feb. 8, 1879, by Senator Hamlin, and was passed by that body Feb. 21—ayes, 37 (33 Republicans, 2 Democrats and 2 Greenbackers); nays, none; not voting, 3 (all Republicans). The House of Representatives passed it on March 5, the vote standing: ayes, 88 (65 Republicans, 16 Greenbackers and 7 Democrats); nays, 31 (17 Republicans, 13 Democrats and 1 Greenbacker); not voting, 14 (10 Republicans, 3 Democrats and 1 Greenbacker). It was approved by Governor John P. St. John March 8, and the day of the Presidential election, Nov. 2, 1880, was named as the day for the popular vote. The State Temperance Union, of which Governor St. John was the President, took charge of the Amendment campaign, and assistance was given by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union Good Templars and other temperance organizations, headquarters being established at Lawrence in charge of Rev. A. M. Richardson. A weekly journal the *Kansas Palladium*, was published at Lawrence, edited by James A. Troutman.

The State was thoroughly canvassed. The clergymen were practically unanimous for the Amendment. The Methodist Episcopal Conference (at Topeka), Kansas Baptist Convention (at Emporia), State Congregational Association (at Sterling) State Universalist Convention (at Junction City) and Presbyterian Synod of Kansas (at Atchison) were among the religious bodies that declared heartily for the measure. The State Teachers' Association at Topeka, in June, 1880, passed a resolution as follows:

> "RESOLVED, That we heartily indorse the Prohibition Amendment and pledge ourselves to use our influence to secure its adoption."

The *Kansas Agriculturalist*, organ of the farmers, emphatically declared "in favor of it, first, last and all the time." But the resources of its advocates were meagre: the funds for prosecuting the campaign aggregated less than $2,500. The liquor men organized a "People's Grand Protective Union," with headquarters at Topeka, appealed for help to "the trade" throughout the country, and received and used large sums of money, although probably not in a very systematic way. Among the Prohibition speakers from other States who participated in the contest were Frances E. Willard, George W. Bain, John B. Finch, E. B. Reynolds Frank J. Sibley, Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, Miss Viola E. Dickman, George Woodford, David Tatum, Prof. George E. Foster and J N. Stearns. Some of the leading local speakers were Rev. D. C. Milner Albert Griffin, Rev Richard Wake, Mrs. Drusilla Wilson, Mrs. M. E. Griffith, Mrs. M. B. Smith, Mrs. R. C. Chase, Miss Blanche Heasbeth, Rev. D. P. Mitchell, Rev. J. H. Byers, Rev. J. R. Detwiler, J. P. Root, Sidney Clarke, A. W. Benson, Judge S. O. Thatcher, W. S. Wait, W. A. H. Hains and John H. Rice.

---

[1] The editor is indebted to Rev. A. M. Richardson of Lawrence, Kan.

The vote by counties was as follows:

	Prohibition.			Prohibition.	
Counties.	Yes.	No.	Counties.	Yes.	No.
Allen	1,305	951	Marion	1,020	825
Anderson	909	870	Marshall	1,428	1,853
Atchison	1,343	3,147	McPherson	2,134	912
Barbour	220	213	Miami	1,488	1,751
Barton	490	1,058	Mitchell	1,348	1,178
Bourbon	1,410	1,964	Montgomery	1,939	1,250
Brown	1,345	1,288	Morris	895	885
Butler	2,211	1,141	Nemaha	1,213	1,185
Chase	597	660	Neosho	1,528	1,164
Chautauqua	1,051	819	Ness	200	216
Cherokee	2,421	1.944	Norton	575	491
Clay	1,296	907	Osage	2,287	1,684
Cloud	1,454	1,261	Osborne	1,035	873
Coffey	1,025	1,209	Ottawa	1,163	835
Cowley	3,243	870	Pawnee	604	218
Crawford	1,655	1,469	Phillips	978	708
Davis	628	607	Pottawatomie	1,121	1,208
Decatur	146	251	Pratt	151	142
Dickinson	1,477	1,222	Reno	1,006	932
Doniphan	821	2,150	Republic	1,330	919
Douglas	2,711	1,602	Rice	1,087	625
Edwards	121	194	Riley	1,178	828
Elk	1,232	564	Rooks	503	696
Ellis	355	463	Rush	315	305
Ellsworth	611	781	Russell	443	655
Ford	125	488	Saline	1,410	1,207
Franklin	1,967	1,293	Sedgwick	1,868	1,716
Graham	207	358	Shawnee	3,159	2,513
Greenwood	1,059	941	Sheridan	101	69
Harper	424	316	Smith	1,274	851
Harvey	1,148	858	Stafford	393	301
Hodgeman	147	65	Sumner	2,394	1,201
Jackson	1,056	1,098	Trego	220	120
Jefferson	1,306	1,723	Wabaunsee	622	990
Jewell	1,557	1,256	Washington	1,112	1,610
Johnson	1,545	1,787	Wilson	1,487	1,069
Kingman	265	346	Woodson	748	530
Labette	2,082	2,123	Wyandotte	1,222	2,481
Leavenworth	1,486	3,882			
Lincoln	613	733	Totals[1]	91,874	84,037
Linn	1,494	1,292	Majority	7,837	
Lyon	2,337	877			

[1] The figures commonly accepted are: For Prohibition, 92,302; against, 84,304—majority for, 7,998. These, however, are incorrect. The official figures are those presented above, as certified to the editor of this work, April 18, 1890, by William Higgins, Secretary of State of Kansas, under his official seal.

Iowa.[1]

The submission of Constitutional Prohibition in Iowa was due, as in Kansas, to a political compromise. The old Prohibitory law of the State, passed in 1855 by the Democrats chiefly through the influence of Hiram Price (who was at that time a Democrat), had been weakened by the Republicans when they came into power. From the beginning it had seemed to be the policy of the Republican party of Iowa to cater to the large German element of the State; and the wine-and-beer-exemption clause was accordingly continued, while no effort was made to shut up the numerous flourishing breweries. In 1877, however, there sprang up a strong political movement for restoring full Prohibition to Iowa. The activity of the Prohibitionists was increased by the nomination in that year of John H. Gear as the Republican candidate for Governor. Mr. Gear was reputed to be an uncompromising anti-Prohibitionist; and the friends of Prohibition set up an independent candidate, Elias Jessup, for whom they polled the considerable vote of 10,545—a vote large enough for the first time since the Republicans obtained the ascendancy in Iowa, to deprive their nominee of a majority of the entire popular vote. This demonstration of political strength by the Prohibitionists made them still more aggressive, and, as we have seen, the demand for Constitutional Prohibition was openly made in 1878. But this demand was held subordinate to that for a strengthened statute. In 1879 Governor Gear aspired to re-election, and the shrewd leaders of his party, in order to avoid the direct issue of improving the Prohibitory statute, caused the following plank to be inserted in their platform, adopted at Des Moines in June:

> "That we reaffirm the position of the Republican party heretofore expressed on the subject of temperance and Prohibition, and we hail with pleasure the beneficent work of Reform Clubs and other organizations in promoting personal temperance, and, in order that the entire question of temperance may be settled in a non-partisan manner, we favor the submission to the people, at a special election, of a Constitutional Amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of all intoxicating liquors as a beverage within the State."

In spite of the Republican pledge, the Prohibition party that had polled 10,545 votes in 1877 did not disband in 1879. Strong pressure was exercised to persuade its leaders not to nominate a candidate against Gear, and Prohibition advocates of much prestige—including Mrs. J. Ellen Foster—opposed a separate nomination. Nevertheless D. R. Dungan was put in the field as the candidate of the Prohibition party for Governor, and 3,258 votes were cast for him. The respectable strength thus retained, under adverse circumstances, by the party Prohibitionists, convinced the politicians that they would become an organized and determined partisan factor in the event of bad faith. Both branches of the Legislature of 1880 were controlled by the Republicans, and a Prohibitory Constitutional Amendment resolution was passed in each House and referred to the Legislature of 1880 for final action. That body (also dominated by the Republicans) approved it, and the question was submitted for the decision of the people at a special election to be held June 27, 1880. The friends of Prohibition worked harmoniously, made a thorough campaign and carried the Amendment by the following vote:

	Prohibition.			Prohibition.	
Counties.	Yes.	No.	Counties.	Yes.	No.
Adair	1,515	904	Buchanan	1,862	1,201
Adams	1,157	820	Buena Vista	1,064	342
Allamakee	1,151	1,803	Butler	1,669	820
Appanoose	2,162	748	Calhoun	985	344
Audubon	807	779	Carroll	1,138	1,556
Benton	2,198	2,081	Cass	1,826	1,725
Black Hawk	2,226	1,755	Cedar	2,191	1,224
Boone	2,205	1,413	Cerro Gordo	1,451	640
Bremer	1,268	1,302	Cherokee	1,151	352

---

[1] The editor is indebted to B. F. Wright of Charles City, Ia., and E. W. Brady of Davenport, Ia.

	Prohibition.	
Counties.	Yes.	No.
Chickasaw	1,382	1,068
Clarke	1,611	452
Clay	707	330
Clayton	1,823	2,965
Clinton	2,629	3,537
Crawford	958	977
Dallas	2,450	1,055
Davis	1,362	1,366
Decatur	1,340	1,137
Delaware	1,803	1,355
Des Moines	1,917	3,653
Dickinson	374	102
Dubuque	1,223	6,283
Emmet	214	29
Fayette	2,371	1,528
Floyd	1,381	1,457
Franklin	1,071	557
Fremont	1,563	1,126
Greene	1,572	773
Grundy	1,155	863
Guthrie	1,933	811
Hamilton	1,344	652
Hancock	409	206
Hardin	2,175	979
Harrison	1,701	1,330
Henry	2,028	1,226
Howard	730	835
Humboldt	615	351
Ida	916	453
Iowa	1,192	1,566
Jackson	1,609	2,356
Jasper	3,148	1,360
Jefferson	1,774	1,284
Johnson	1,770	2,608
Jones	2,484	1,179
Keokuk	1,873	2,321
Kossuth	706	625
Lee	2,290	3,552
Linn	4,434	2,830
Louisa	1,595	824
Lucas	1,529	693
Lyon	259	101
Madison	1,966	1,103
Mahaska	2,761	1,855
Marion	2,427	1,811
Marshall	2,538	1,798
Mills	1,327	1,018
Mitchell	1,200	881
Monona	853	399
Monroe	1,284	700
Montgomery	1,832	671
Muscatine	2,114	2,023
O'Brien	719	278
Osceola	394	168
Page	2,206	965
Palo Alto	511	306
Plymouth	750	1,186
Pocahontas	449	204
Polk	4,630	2,519
Pottawattamie	2,576	3,468
Poweshiek	2,211	1,048
Ringgold	1,640	570
Sac	1,383	548
Scott	1,467	5,197
Shelby	1,313	1,231
Sioux	432	558
Story	1,921	553
Tama	2,244	1,477
Taylor	1,656	654
Union	1,687	1,008
Van Buren	1,543	1,543
Wapello	1,465	2,493
Warren	2,131	1,173
Washington	2,201	1,679
Wayne	1,849	1,007
Webster	1,498	1,260
Winnebago	557	89
Winneshiek	1,411	1,696
Woodbury	1,163	1,220
Worth	784	350
Wright	897	401
Totals	155,436	125,677
Majority	29,759	

This decisive result did not, however, immediately have its legitimate effect. The Republican State Convention met Aug. 1, 1882—five weeks after the great Prohibition victory—and strangely refused to allow any expression on the Amendment or Prohibition question to appear in the platform. It was the programme of the leaders to divorce the party, if possible, from the Prohibitory issue, so as to hold the German vote for the Republican candidates for Congress in the coming November. But this cowardly attitude had the contrary effect; general demoralization ensued and the Republicans lost three Congressmen.

Another and a more serious repudiation of the will of the people seemed, for awhile, to vitiate the effect of the vote. In the fall of 1882 the Supreme Court of Iowa, by the decision of four of its Judges, declared, in an appeal case, that the Amendment had not been properly submitted to the people. The Court found that a certain amendment of three words which had been added by the Legislature of 1880 to the original text of the Submission act did not appear in the Legislative Journal as kept by the Clerk of the House. It was admitted that the Constitutional Amendment itself, as voted on by the people, was precisely the same, in every word, as the Constitutional Amendment submitted by the Legislatures of 1880 and 1882; but the Court held that the slight and immaterial omission in the Clerk's Journal of three words that had been added to the original text of the act of submission was sufficient to invalidate the popular vote. Accordingly the Constitutional Amendment was on this technical ground annulled. The Prohibitionists quickly manifested their determination not to lose the fruits of their victory. A mammoth State Convention, on a non-partisan basis, was held a few months later, and it was plainly declared in the resolutions adopted by that body that the dominant party would be held responsible for any failure to carry out the unmistakable desire of the great majority of the citizens of Iowa. In the next Legislature a statutory Prohibitory law was passed, which was subsequently strengthened and which, because of its demonstrated success in nearly the whole of Iowa and the support accorded it by the people, has stood the test of all efforts made for its repeal or the modification of its provisions.

Ohio.[1]

We have seen that Ohio has since 1851 sustained a unique relationship to the liquor question. While the Constitution prohibits license it does not provide for Prohibition. Although the Anti License clause was at first regarded by the temperance people as a decree in favor of Prohibition, the politicians refused to recognize it as such and the traffic was practically unrestrained. But the representative liquor men and their political friends looked with much dissatisfaction upon the Anti-License clause. Its effect was to discourage all attempts to define the precise status of the business and put it on a permanent and strictly legal basis. Consequently efforts were made to repeal the Anti-License clause and substitute for it a Constitutional Amendment permitting license. In 1874 such an Amendment was submitted to the people, and the vote on it stood: For, 172,252; against, 179,538; total vote on Secretary of State at same election, 461,425; necessary to the adoption of the License Amendment, 233,713; License Amendment short of a majority, 61,461; majority against license of those voting on the question, 7,286. This defeat of the license advocates demonstrated the impracticability of the scheme of amending the Constitution in behalf of the liquor interests, although the Democratic party did not cease to advocate license. Meanwhile the liquor question continued prominent in State politics. The Prohibition party maintained its organization and nominated separate candidates each year, and there was every probability that the pressure for Prohibition would increase. The brewers and liquor-dealers—or the responsible men among them—desired a definite law for the "regulation" and protection of the business. The conservative temperance people favored regulation, restriction and revenue, and also advocated Local Option and Sunday-closing. The Germans, forming a very influential element in Ohio, manifested extreme sensitiveness and stood ready to resent at the polls any serious interference with "personal liberty." The State, though naturally Republican, was considered fickle, and the problem of dealing judiciously with the delicate liquor question was a most perplexing one for the politicians.

During the administration of Governor Foster—one of the shrewdest of all the Ohio Republican leaders—the policy of circumventing the Anti-License provision of the Constitution by the enactment of "tax" laws at last became the settled policy of the Republican party. The Pond Tax law was passed in 1880, and though soon declared unconstitutional by the State Supreme Court, was followed by the Scott Tax law of 1883. Meanwhile the Republicans experimented with Sunday-closing legislation, passing the Smith Sunday bill only to repeal it after finding that it was distasteful to the Germans and the whole liquor element. During the 1883 session of the Legislature the chief work before the Republican majority was to frame and pass a liquor tax bill to take the place of the unconstitutional Pond law. The Scott bill (introduced by Dr. Scott, Representative from Warren County) was accepted by the party leaders after it had obtained the full approval of the brewers. At the last preceding Gubernatorial election (1881) the Prohibition party had polled the largest vote ever cast by it up to that time in Ohio—16,597, as against only 2 616 in 1880. The Prohibitionists now made no secret of their hostility to the Scott bill and demanded the submission of a Prohibitory Amendment. Both the Scott bill and the Amendment proposition had active supporters in the Legislature, while a strong element opposed both. Finally a compromise was effected, the Amendment advocates voting for the Scott bill and the champions of the Scott bill consenting to submission. This agreement was not carried out, however, until it was arranged that two Amendments should be submitted to the people concurrently, one providing for license and the other for Prohibition, so that the liquor men might have another opportunity to insert a license clause in the Constitution. During the campaign that followed the License Amendment was familiarly known as the 1st Amendment. and the Prohibitory Amendment as the 2d Amendment. The day for deciding whether license or Prohibition should prevail was also the day of the State and legislative elections. J. B. Foraker and George Hoadly, respectively, were the Republican and Democratic candidates for Governor. Mr. Foraker, in a speech delivered soon after his nomination, made the notable declaration that ' the principles of regulation and taxation for which it [the Republican party] declares are eternal and will stand; and to these principles of regulation and taxation of the liquor traffic, be it known of all men, the Republican party is unalterably committed."[1] Mr. Hoadly, who had been connected with the liquor interests as their lawyer, announced himself as decidedly for license, and both the Republican and Democratic parties were arrayed against Prohibition throughout the contest, although the latter was the more demonstrative.

---

[1] The editor is indebted to Mrs. Mary A. Woodbridge of Ravenna, O., and Oscar B. Todhunter of Cincinnati.

The opponents of Prohibition not only had the co operation of the political leaders and organizations but commanded the services of the great newspapers of the State—the Cincinnati *Commercial Gazette* and *Enquirer*, the Cleveland *Leader* and *Plain Dealer*, etc., most of them attacking Prohibition with extreme bitterness and treating the arguments of its friends unfairly, unscrupulously and contemptuously. It was impossible to obtain a hearing for the Prohibition cause in the influential press. The liquor interests, although they did not fight so actively and systematically against Prohibition as they did in subsequent Amendment contests in other States, were far more aggressive than they had been in either Iowa or Kansas. The brewers offered organized resistance, under the leadership of Leo Ebert of Ironton, and the local organizations of saloon-keepers exhibited a lively interest. Besides, the Prohibition movement was discountenanced by many individuals who professed devotion to the interests of "true temperance." One of the particularly discouraging things was the publication of a letter from Rev. Theodore L. Cuyler D. D., the well-known Eastern temperance champion, in the *National Temperance Advocate* for October, 1883, in which Dr. Cuyler wrote:

> "The defeat of the Scott law would be a disaster to our cause. It is probably the best law that the present Constitution of Ohio makes possible; and our friends ought not to assume the responsibility of overthrowing it. A partial victory this year in the election of Foraker and the maintenance of the Scott law must strengthen our hands for a further advance in restrictive legislation. During the Civil War some of the old and impracticable Abolitionists did little else than cavil at and cripple Abraham Lincoln because he did not adopt their shibboleth and pursue their policy. We temperance reformers must not sacrifice our blessed cause to the unreasonable demands of the impracticables. If we can hold the Scott redoubt in Ohio, then are our guns planted just so much nearer the enemy's citadel."[2]

Nevertheless the Prohibitionists made a most aggressive, enthusiastic, thorough and hopeful campaign It was in charge of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union Circulars were addressed to well-nigh every class of citizens—ministers, educators, students, manufacturers, railroad companies and their employees, etc,—and abundant encouragement and assistance was volunteered. There were scores of able speakers in the field, including John B. Finch, John P. St. John, George W. Bain, George Woodford, M. V. B. Bennett, Frances E. Willard, Mary T. Lathrap and Walter T. Mills. Crowded meetings were held everywhere, and the masses showed a very cordial feeling. The prospect of victory seemed to grow brighter as the campaign progressed. The evidences of the great strength of Prohibition sentiment were not apparent to the politicians at the outset, but they became distinct in the closing month. John B. Finch one morning announced at Prohibition headquarters that a political council had been held in Cincinnati and it had been decided that the Amendment must not carry. Mr. Finch also said that every political device would be used to keep down the vote, and exhibited many Democratic and Republican tickets upon which the Prohibitory Amendment proposition was inaccurately printed. In Hamilton County and other counties all the Democratic ballots had printed upon them, after the 1st Amendment only the word "Yes," and after the 2d Amendment only the word "No"—a deliberate device for securing, in behalf of license and against Prohibition the support of all Democrats who were indifferent on the liquor question or who were accustomed to vote the "straight" Democratic ticket without critical inspection. Other unscrupulous tactics were used by the opposition, and the work of the Prohibitionists was thus handicapped in the most effective manner. Notwithstanding all, the vote for Prohibition was so overwhelming, as evidenced by the returns received up to midnight of the day of the election, that there was no reasonable doubt in any quarter of the success of the proposition. The figures of the Central Committees of the Republican and Democratic parties on that evening indicated a vote for Prohibition many thousands in excess of that subsequently shown by the official returns. Both these Committees, in telegraphic messages, reported 30,000 votes for the Prohibitory Amendment in Hamilton County; but the official canvass gave only 8,402 for the Amendment in a total of 60,761 in that county. There were indisputable evidences of fraud in the count, and the result was that though the Prohibitory Amendment had a majority of 82,214 of those voting on the question, it lacked 37,467 of a majority of all the votes polled on State candidates, and therefore, according to the requirements of the Ohio Constitution, failed of adoption. An effort was made by the Prohibitionists to bring about a recount of the ballots, but it was urged that the docket of the Supreme Court was overcrowded and that, since the Court would soon be Democratic, nothing could come of such an attempt.

---

[1] From a speech before the Lincoln Club of Cincinnati, as reported in the Cincinnati *Commercial Gazette*, June 25, 1883.

[2] Mrs. Mary A. Woodbridge, commenting on Dr. Cuyler's letter, says: "'The Scott redoubt' repealed the law making the sale of liquor over the bar, or to be drunk on the premises, or upon the Sabbath day, statutory crimes. It gave us a Local Option Sabbath, and gave the liquor-dealer right to sell without filing an application or securing a bond. It removed all restrictions and elevated the business to a legal plane with other trades. Its vaunted Local Option feature gave no power to suppress the sale, only to close places when they became unmitigated nuisances."

The outcome was, however, a great moral victory for the cause of Prohibition, all the greater in view of the ignominious defeat of the License Amendment. That proposition was supported by the whole strength of the liquor influence and the managers of the Democratic party—the party that carried Ohio on the same day for its State and legislative tickets, polling 359,793 votes for Hoadly for Governor; yet the License Amendment received only 99,849 votes, while 192 197 were cast against it, making an anti-license majority of 92,268 of those voting on the license question, while the license programme lacked 260,807 of a Constitutional majority. Yet though the people, by a most extraordinary preponderance of sentiment, showed their preference for Prohibition as against license, every effort to establish the Prohibitory policy in Ohio has been crushed by the politicians of both the leading parties, and the liquor legislation of the State has been shaped, as it was previously to the election of Oct. 9, 1883, in behalf of the liquor interests.

The following table shows the vote by counties for and against the License and Prohibitory Amendments:

	LICENSE.		PROHIBITION.	
COUNTIES.	Yes.	No.	Yes.	No.
Adams	138	......	3,150	......
Allen	1,002	2,823	3,667	2,379
Ashland	889	2,777	2,961	2,041
Ashtabula	539	1,241	6,699	570
Athens	806	2,420	4,099	1,291
Anglaize	627	4,467	1,386	3,798
Belmont	1,473	7,408	6,154	3,785
Brown	720	......	3,519	......
Butler	2,240	4,497	1,970	4,949
Carroll	507	646	2,725	......
Champaign	976	951	3,503	1,036
Clark	1,749	3,150	5,694	3,199
Clermont	1,086	......	3,941	......
Clinton	809	......	3,530	......
Columbiana	1,252	5,158	6,651	2,505
Coshocton	493	3,051	3,251	1,481
Crawford	963	3,538	2,784	3,358
Cuyahoga	2,850	15,341	12,954	16,350
Darke	1,232	.....	3,555	......
Defiance	874	4,134	2,232	3,762
Delaware	812	2,673	4,070	1,392
Erie	1,366	......	1,860	......
Fairfield	921	......	3,193	......
Fayette	692	.. ...	3,327	......
Franklin	3,185	9,037	6,203	8,455
Fulton	624	......	2,819	......
Gallia	248	434	2,721	316
Geauga	324	1,772	2,525	375
Greene	800	......	4,374	......
Guernsey	654	......	4,203	......
Hamilton	14,780	34,375	8,402	41,437
Hancock	511	......	3,797	......
Hardin	812	4,925	3,922	2,673
Harrison	574	2,967	3,387	814
Henry	679	1,506	2,199	1,083
Highland	715	2,446	3,966	1,163
Hocking	548	......	2,311	....
Holmes	674	......	1,763	......
Huron	542	6,748	4,181	3,466
Jackson	439	......	3,372	......
Jefferson	1,286	2,406	4,455	1,190
Knox	1,144	3,028	3,803	1,940
Lake	448	......	2,468	......
Lawrence	1,268	3,194	2,900	2,388
Licking	1,248	3,374	4,057	2,731
Logan	1,354	......	4,051	......
Lorain	615	572	5,007	624
Lucas	3,080	8,999	4,914	3,738
Madison	492	1,004	2,526	609
Mahoning	2,007	4,431	4,502	3,801
Marion	774	2,234	2,820	1,098
Medina	645	4,761	2,948	2,458
Meigs	577	......	2,852	......
Mercer	481	2,604	1,732	2,047
Miami	1,241	3,001	4,331	2,536
Monroe	1,014	2,358	1,789	2,126
Montgomery	4,393	13,459	6,443	12,878
Morgan	217	......	2,649	1,322
Morrow	877	2,075	2,474	3,616
Muskingum	1,114	6,920	5,534	......
Noble	563	......	2,753	......
Ottawa	387	......	1,245	......
Paulding	611	1,108	2,311	726
Perry	491	3,913	3,272	2,225
Pickaway	943	2,663	2,457	2,232
Pike	564	1,342	1,881	1,013
Portage	483	......	3,373	......
Preble	1,189	3,337	2,167	2,841
Putnam	358	.... ..	2,715	......
Richland	965	2,648	4,433	2,403
Ross	1,673	.....	3,765	..
Sandusky	960	3,821	2,619	2,816
Scioto	613	2,866	2,104	2,568
Seneca	757	......	3,789	......
Shelby	878	......	2,201	......
Stark	1,681	.... ..	7,791	......
Summit	1,188	3,068	5,004	2,643
Trumbull	1,140	4,391	5,322	2,070
Tuscarawas	930	......	4,421	......
Union	881	3,832	3,578	1,703
Van Wert	985	2,832	3,195	1,710
Vinton	333	2,086	1,434	1,679
Warren	1,192	2,908	2,759	1,911
Washington	866	2,326	3,935	2,351
Wayne	975	3,378	5,113	2,652
Williams	501	......	3,264	......
Wood	940	.....	4,279	......
Wyandot	771	2,351	2,674	1,802
Totals	99,849	192,117	323,189	240,975
Majorities		92,268	82,214	
Whole vote on State officers				721,310
Necessary to adopt either Amendment				360,656

Maine.

The friends of the Maine law have always had difficulty in persuading political leaders to make certain enforcement provisions of the statute thoroughly radical. After 30 years of statutory Prohibition in Maine, the Prohibitionists were still pleading for important additions. The politicians replied that there was already as much law as public sentiment would sustain. "Very well," answered the Prohibitionists, "Let us test public sentiment by submitting to the people a Constitutional Amendment." After much hesitation the political leaders assented, and at the legislative session of 1884 (a concurrent vote of two-thirds being required) the two branches submitted the Amendment, the vote standing in the Senate 21 yeas to 1 nay (a Democrat), and in the House 91 yeas (five of them being Democrats) to 30 nays (23 Democrats and 7 Republicans). The resolve was approved by the Governor on Feb. 21, and the popular vote was taken at the regular State election in September. As originally framed, the Amendment contained the words, "The Legislature shall enact laws," etc. The politicians, before submitting the proposition, voted to substitute the word "may" for "shall." but "shall" was restored after a long wrangle. A spirited campaign was waged. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union and Good Templars did active work. John B. Finch made speeches, as did Col. R. S. Cheves of Kentucky, Mr. Mann of Alabama, A. A. Phelps of New York, Mr. Munson, Grand Worthy Chief Templar of Maine, United States Senator Frye, Congressman Dingley, Miss Frances E. Willard, Mrs. L. M. N. Stevens, Mrs. Mary A. Woodbridge, Mrs. Pearson of England, Emily Pitt Stevens of California and many others. The anti-Prohibitionists held no public meetings, but strove in various ways to defeat the Amendment. The Democratic press of the State opposed it, and the Republican newspapers with but few exceptions discouraged the movement quietly, not daring to offer open opposition. Comparatively little help came to the Prohibitionists from outside the State in the way of pecuniary contributions, but there were some donations: Dr. R. H. McDonald of San Francisco sent a check for $500. Lewiston was the only city giving a negative majority.

The election was held while the exciting Blaine-Cleveland Presidential contest was at its height. Persistent efforts had been made by the friends of Prohibition throughout the country to induce the Republican and Democratic parties and their leading representatives to consider and discuss the Prohibition issue according to its merits, and Mr. Cleveland, the Democratic candidate, had inserted in his letter of acceptance a paragraph opposing Prohibitory laws. Mr. Blaine had not, however, committed himself. Since he was a citizen of Maine his action upon the Constitutional Amendment then pending was awaited with much curiosity. At the election in September he went to the polls in the city of Augusta, voted for the Republican candidates, and, although requested by the ladies to vote also for the Amendment, declined to do so, and ignored that measure. In an address made that evening he said:

> "The issue of a temperance Amendment to the Constitution has been very properly and very rigidly separated from the political contest of the State to-day. Many Democrats voted for it and some Republicans voted against it. The Republican party, by the desire of many leading temperance men, took no action as a party on the Amendment. For myself, I decided not to vote at all on the question. I took this position because I am chosen by the Republican party as the representative of national issues, and by no act of mine shall any question be obtruded into the national campaign which belongs properly to the domain of State politics. Certain advocates of Prohibition and certain opponents of Prohibition are each seeking to drag this issue into the national canvass, and thus tending to exclude from popular consideration questions which press for national decision. If there be any question that belongs solely to the police power of the State it is the control of the liquor traffic, and wise men will not neglect national issues in the year of the national contest. The judicious friends of Protective tariff, which is the practical issue of the campaign, will not divert their votes to the question of Prohibition, which is not a practical issue in a national campaign."

The vote by counties stood as follows:

	Prohibition.			Prohibition.	
Counties.	Yes.	No.	Counties.	Yes.	No.
Androscoggin.	4,486	2,438	Piscataquis....	2,212	356
Aroostook.....	3,899	782	Sagadahoc....	2,385	741
Cumberland...	9,247	3,856	Somerset......	4,191	1,227
Franklin......	2,571	623	Waldo........	3,492	1,108
Hancock......	3,047	806	Washington...	3,755	812
Kennebec.....	7,168	2,175	York..........	7,208	2,750
Knox..........	3,049	755			
Lincoln........	2,631	586	Totals......	70,783	23,811
Oxford........	4,062	1,718	Majority...	46,972	
Penobscot.....	7,380	3,078			

NEAL DOW.

South Dakota.

The vote on Constitutional Prohibition in South Dakota in 1885, being simply experimental (since no part of Dakota Territory had at that time been admitted into the Union of States, and there was no prospect of early admission), excited little interest. No general campaign was made, and the indifference of the public was shown by the very small total vote —less than 31,000.

Rhode Island.

Rhode Island is the only State in which Constitutional Prohibition has been repealed; she adopted a Prohibitory Amendment April 7, 1886, by more than a three-fifths popular vote, and annulled it June 20, 1889, also by more than three-fifths. The circumstances leading to the repeal are presented in the proper place. (See pp. 124-6.)

Long before Constitutional Prohibition was agitated, Rhode Island had enacted and rescinded Prohibitory statutes. In 1852 a Prohibitory law was passed by a Democratic Legislature, which was declared unconstitutional in 1853, re-enacted by the "Know-Nothings" in 1855 and repealed by the Republicans in 1863. Again in 1874, after a spirited fight, Prohibition was enacted by statute, and again in 1875 the liquor politicians were strong enough to repeal it. These successive victories and defeats showed the strength of the Prohibitory sentiment, but demonstrated the superior strength of unscrupulous partisan managers. Yet it was apparent that the majority of the dominant party would have sustained the Prohibition principle if left untrammeled by the liquor leaders; for in 1875, on the direct issue of the repeal of the Prohibition law, the Gubernatorial vote stood: Independent Prohibition candidate, 8,724; Republican (liquor) candidate, 8,368; Democratic (neutral) candidate, 5,166. After the success of Constitutional Prohibition in Kansas, the friends of Prohibition in Rhode Island abandoned their efforts to re-enact the old statute, and united in behalf of an Amendment to the Constitution. In 1881, 1882 and 1883 they petitioned the Legislature, but were unable to secure even a favorable report from the Legislative Committee. After the adjournment of the Legislature of 1883 the Woman's Christian Temperance Union began a vigorous campaign for submission, and large meetings were held, addressed by Mrs. Mary A. Livermore, Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, John P. St. John, George W. Bain and John B. Finch. In 1884 a petition for submission signed by 11,000 citizens was presented to the Legislature, and on March 25 a Submission resolution passed the House of Representatives by 53 yeas to 8 nays; it was approved by the Senate unanimously. The endorsement of the next Legislature (to be chosen in April, 1884) was required before the Amendment could go to the people. It was now discovered that there had been a technical defect in the proceedings already taken, and the work had to be done anew. Despite the irritations occasioned by the St. John campaign, the Legislature of 1885 voted unanimously for submission, and the Legislature of 1886 (March 10) did the same.

Less than four weeks' time was allowed for the campaign. At the start very few of the Prohibitionists hoped for victory. The obstacles seemed to be insurmountable. Three-fifths of all the votes cast upon the question were required for the adoption of the article. Rhode Island was then regarded as one of the most conservative States of the Union, the right of suffrage being limited by a property qualification. The State Census of 1885 showed that 58 per cent. of the population was embraced within four cities, while in those cities 30 per cent. of the people were of foreign birth; and the proportion of the inhabitants engaged in manufacturing pursuits was very large. Rhode Island was also, at that time, one of the strongest of Republican States, and it was to be expected that Republican resentment against the Prohibitionists, stimulated by bitter memories of the St. John campaign, would be practically manifested in Rhode Island, as it had been in the New York town meetings that spring. Indeed, the management of the Republican party of the State was thoroughly under the control of the liquor interests.

The opponents of Prohibition looked with idle curiosity and amusement upon the efforts of the Amendment's friends. They considered the prospects of a Prohibition majority so slight as to require no active attention, and the uncommonly interesting struggle for important political offices absorbed their energies. The position of Attorney-General is a highly influential one in Rhode Island, and the person occupying it is directly responsible for the administration of the liquor laws. Attorney-General Colt had been entirely subservient to the rumsellers, and damaging revelations had been made public concerning the conduct of his office. His re-election was desired by the saloon element, which had forced his renomination in the Republican Convention. The affairs of practical politics thus engaged the liquor men, and they ignored the Prohibitory Amendment. Although a considerable sum of money had been provided for opposing the Amendment—about $10,000—it was either not expended at all or was not used effectively.

At this time Rhode Island was under a low license law, so moderate in its provisions that the most sensitive advocates of the "rights" of the liquor traffic could have found little fault with it. Yet the liquor-dealers were not content with these easy conditions; they insisted on nullifying the mild restrictions of the statutes, they compelled the officials to disregard the law and they required the dominant party to accept their servants as candidates for office. The disgraceful situation was well known to the people of the State; the notorious violations of one of the most moderate liquor laws of the country had been going on for years; it was understood to be impossible to punish even the most flagrant offenses in the city of Providence, and the public disgust was intensified by the exposures in the Attorney-General's office. A very large number of people not entirely in sympathy with the Prohibition policy were therefore ready to record their protest against the existing conditions, and the Prohibitory Amendment provided them an immediate opportunity. The belief that there was no chance for the Amendment's adoption smoothed the way for these conservative individuals. To understand the triumph of Prohibition in Rhode Island in 1886 this explanation must be given prominent recognition.

The Prohibition canvass was very dexterously managed. No important help was received from the press, but on the other hand the leading newspapers did not offer material opposition. The Providence *Journal*, at that time the leading Republican daily and afterwards the most powerful antagonist of Constitutional Prohibition in Rhode Island, did not mention the subject until just before the election, when it printed a few articles indirectly opposing the Amendment. The Providence *Telegram* (Democratic daily) mildly opposed it. The campaign was under the direction of two organizations, the State Woman's Christian Temperance Union, headed by Mrs. E. S. Burlingame, and an organization composed of representatives of the Rhode Island Temperance Union, Good Templars and other societies, led by Rev. H. W. Conant. Effective literature was freely used, there were many able speakers and the clergy gave active assistance. A striking feature was the organization of Blue Ribbon clubs, composed of young men who donned the blue ribbon and sought to awaken general interest. This movement was inaugurated by Senator Colquitt.

The returns showed not only the triumph of the Amendment but the election for Attorney-General of Edwin Metcalf, candidate of the Prohibition party (endorsed by the Democrats) over Samuel P. Colt, the Republican liquor nominee, by 14,089 to 12,445, although on Governor the Republicans had a majority of 1,805 over both Prohibitionists and Democrats. The following table gives the vote by counties on the Constitutional Amendment:

Counties.	Prohibition. Yes.	Prohibition. No.
Bristol	797	575
Newport	1,557	917
Providence	9,487	6,502
Washington	2,087	395
Totals	15,113	9,230
Majority	5,883	
Majority in excess of three-fifths	507	

James W. Williams.

CAMPAIGNS OF 1887–9.

Michigan.[1]

After the last vestiges of the Prohibitory legislation enacted in Michigan before the war had been swept away and the Tax law had been instituted, the temperance people made some feeble efforts to restore the old statute. They met definite defeat in the Legislature of 1879, the House of Representatives voting down the Mosher Prohibitory bill by 50 to 37. (The House contained 66 Republicans, 19 Democrats and 13 Labor men, and there were two vacancies.) In 1881 (the Senate being Republican by 30 to 2 and the House by 86 to 14), more than 100,000 citizens petitioned for the submission of a Prohibitory Amendment. On Feb. 23, 1881, during the session of the Legislature, a Republican State Convention met at Lansing and in its platform placed the following:

> "Resolved, That when the people by petition manifest a desire to alter or amend the Constitution their wishes should receive that consideration to which they are entitled as coming from the source of all political power."

But submission was defeated in the House by a vote of 61 yeas to 32 nays—less than the necessary two-thirds voting in the affirmative. The Republican State Convention of 1882 (Aug. 30) reaffirmed the submission pledge but the Legislatures of 1883 and 1885 failed to submit. Aug. 26, 1886, the Republican State Convention again pledged submission, and the Legislature of 1887, though not expected or requested to do so, finally redeemed the pledge.[2] This action was due to the aggression of the Prohibition party. Previously to 1881 the party was very feeble in Michigan, having polled only 942 votes for President in 1880. But in 1881 it suddenly became a serious factor, polling 12,774 votes at the comparatively unimportant spring election. For the next four years its votes were: 1882, 5,854; 1883, 13,950; 1884 (President), 18,403; 1885, 14,708. The repeated failure of the Republicans to redeem their submission pledge made the party Prohibitionists stronger than ever in 1886; and Samuel Dickie, their candidate for Governor in that year, made a very energetic canvass and polled 25,179 votes. Previously to 1881 very few States had given Republican pluralities as large as Michigan's; and in 1880 Roscoe Conkling, in reply to a statement that Michigan would rally nobly for a certain candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination, had sneeringly remarked, "Anybody can carry Michigan!" But there was a strong Greenback element in the State, which, by fusion with the Democrats, actually defeated the Republican party in 1882, 1883 and 1885, and came within about 3,300 of wresting the Electoral vote from Blaine in 1884. With an aggressive Prohibition party in the field, controlling 25,000 votes, the Republicans could not afford to repudiate their submission pledge for a fourth time, and so the Legislature of 1887 decided to submit the Amendment.

The friends of Prohibition were not prepared for the contest, but they took prompt action. On Feb. 11 a mass convention was held at Detroit and a State Amendment Committee was organized, composed of 10 Republicans, 10 Democrats and 10 Prohibitionists. On Feb. 16 Prof. Samuel Dickie was chosen Chairman of this Committee. The campaign was of 46 days' duration. Some liberal contributions of money were made, and a great number of prominent speakers from many States gave their services. The Good Templars, Sons of Temperance and other organizations were very active, and the State Woman's Christian Temperance Union, under the management of Mrs. Mary T. Lathrap, (President) and Mrs. Emma A. Wheeler (Secretary) was an important factor. No material help was received from the political leaders of the old parties, and the failure of Governor Luce to give his influence for the Amendment was especially disappointing, since the Governor was known as a life-long temperance man, and the Farmers' Alliance, with which he had been identified, had adopted energetic Prohibition resolutions. Congressmen Allen and Cutcheon were probably the most prominent public men openly supporting the cause. Every daily newspaper in the State was hostile or silent. A conspicuous effort was made to command the formal antagonism of conservative men not personally identified with the liquor traffic, and two distinguished gentlemen, D. Bethune Duffield and Prof. Kent, made speeches against the Amendment. Their arguments were founded on the claim that the High License (or tax) system then prevailing in Michigan was preferable to Prohibitory law; and the impression made upon the masses of the people by their pleas was so effective that Miss Willard afterwards declared that the Michigan Amendment had "died of High License." Mr. Duffield was met in debate however, by John B. Finch, who made a very able and eloquent reply, supported by a great array of testimony. The liquor-sellers themselves put no speakers in the field, but they operated in secret ways, receiving the co-operation of the traffic in other States, the sum of $5,000 being contributed by the United States Brewers' Association.

At the election frauds were perpetrated systematically by the liquor men, especially in Detroit and Gogebic County. It was proved by what the Detroit *Free Press* called "shoals of affidavits" that the election in Detroit was a mere farce; in one precinct from which only nine votes for the Amendment were returned, more than 70 men made affidavit that they had voted for it. Gogebic County was created by the Legislature of 1887 out of Ontonagon County, which in November, 1886, cast only 1,589 votes. Yet this new county, at the Amendment election, returned 2,527 votes, of which 2 341 were against Prohibition. The evidences of fraud were duly presented, in detail, to the Legislature, which was still in session, but that body refused to appoint an investigating committee.

---

[1] The editor is indebted to Samuel Dickie.

[2] The work of submission was not accomplished, however, without a lively contest. In the House of Representatives the Submission resolution went through (Jan. 13) with little opposition, by a vote of 74 yeas to 21 nays (ten Democrats voting in the affirmative and only one Republican voting in the negative). In the Senate 22 votes were needed, and 23 of the Senators were Republicans. But two of the Republican Senators (Seymour and Hubbell) rebelled, and before the resolution could be carried it was necessary for the Republican leaders to oust a Democrat and swear in a new Republican Senator. The Senate voted to submit on Jan. 27: yeas, 22 (all Republicans); nays, 10 (8 Democrats and 2 Republicans).

The following is the vote on the Prohibitory Amendment by counties:

	Prohibition.	
Counties.	Yes.	No.
Alcona........	331	361
Alger..........	56	170
Allegan........	4,649	2,728
Alpena.........	1,003	1,463
Antrim........	1,094	657
Arenac.........	362	486
Baraga	151	371
Barry..........	3,099	1,933
Bay............	2,458	5,078
Benzie.........	693	213
Berrien........	4,112	4,052
Branch.........	4,334	1,691
Calhoun... ...	5,458	3,424
Cass	2,808	1,701
Charlevoix.....	1,295	456
Cheboygan....	753	973
Chippewa.....	640	524
Clare	682	508
Clinton........	3,389	2,583
Crawford......	219	223
Delta..........	222	1,347
Eaton	5,318	2,088
Emmet........	907	531
Genesee.......	4,769	3,190
Gladwin.......	225	188
Gogebic.......	186	2,341
Grand Traverse	1,355	815
Gratiot........	3,648	1,607
Hillsdale......	5,266	1,873
Houghton	1,166	2,684
Huron	1,696	2,264
Ingham........	5,477	2,648
Ionia..........	4,846	2,095
Iosco..........	1,187	1,058
Iron	129	720
Isabella........	2,175	840
Isle Royal.....	No returns	
Jackson..... .	5,226	4,302
Kalamazoo....	4,215	3,390
Kalkaska......	618	283
Kent....... ..	6,642	10,997
Keweenaw.....	153	285
Lake..........	1,008	570
Lapeer........	2,847	2,636
Leelanaw......	562	604
Lenawee.......	5,771	4,784
Livingston.....	2,949	2,017
Luce..........	149	188
Mackinac......	392	557
Macomb.......	1,719	4,279
Manistee.......	1,527	1,799
Manitou.......	18	124
Marquette......	1,475	3.013
Mason.........	1,413	1,094
Mecosta.......	2,159	1,454
Menominee ...	1,242	2,601
Midland.......	1,320	691
Missaukee	418	358
Monroe........	2,121	3,757
Montcalm.....	4,631	2,032
Montmorency..	168	103
Muskegon.......	2,819	3,882
Newaygo.... .	2,309	1,273
Oakland.......	4,435	4,687
Oceana	2,053	731
Ogemaw.......	359	475
Ontonagon.....	64	286
Osceola	1,686	759
Oscoda	178	132
Otsego........	572	257
Ottawa........	2,829	3,043
Presque Isle...	67	748
Roscommon...	160	174
Saginaw.... ..	3,181	9,033
Sanilac.......	2,161	2,458
Schoolcraft....	384	554
Shiawassee....	3,934	2,241
St. Clair.......	2,909	5,875
St. Joseph .	3,321	2,159
Tuscola.......	3,523	2,222
Van Buren.....	5,111	1,549
Washtenaw....	4,110	4,999
Wayne........	5,860	28,169
Wexford.......	1,410	773
Totals......	178,636	184,281
Majority....		5,545

Texas.[1]

In the Amendment contest in Texas, more than in any other State, North or South, the political leaders engaged in a general discussion of the question, and openly took sides upon it. The refusal of the Prohibition managers to accept offers of speakers from the North, the publication of Jefferson Davis's letter against Prohibition, the successful efforts of the liquor advocates to control the negro vote and the heavy rural majorities in opposition to the Amendment, were other unique features.

To satisfy the temperance people, a clause guaranteeing Local Option was placed in the Texas Constitution in 1875. For a number of years Local Option work absorbed the energies of the saloon's opponents, but the weakness of this method was finally recognized, and from 1881 to 1887 the Legislature was repeatedly petitioned to submit a Prohibitory Constitutional Amendment. Submission, when obtained, was due to the organization and activity of the Prohibition party. Until 1886 there had been no separate party movement by the Prohibitionists, although 3.534 votes had been secured for St. John in Texas without organization. In 1886 the Democrats refused to pledge the submission of an Amendment. A Prohibition Convention was then held, a State ticket was nominated with E. L. Dohoney as the candidate for Governor, and 19,186 votes were polled for Mr. Dohoney. The Legislature of 1887 promptly voted to submit, the House of Representatives passing the Submission resolution by 80 yeas to 21 nays, and the Senate concurring (Feb. 25) by 22 yeas to 8 nays. This Legislature was overwhelmingly Democratic—unanimously so in the Senate, while the House of Representatives contained only six opposition members in a total of 109.

In the campaign, for which preparations were promptly made, Rev. B. H. Carroll, D.D., was Chairman of the Prohibition Executive Committee, and a fund of $15.000 was raised in the State, which was increased by contributions from the North—considerable sums being subscribed by readers of the *Voice.* The liquor element showed an aggressive disposition from the start, and with the approval of some of the chief Democratic politicians—notably Congressman Roger Q. Mills, Lieutenant-Governor Barnett Gibbs, and Speaker Pendleton of the Texas House of Representatives—announced that the anti-Prohibition fight would be essentially a Democratic party fight. These rum champions, at the outset, issued a curious call for a State meeting, in which they ventured to solicit the attendance, among other lovers of the liquor-saloons, of "all who have not yet lost faith in the church, the home and the school; patriots who revere the grandeur of our great State; all who believe the people of Texas are a religious people; all Christian people." But the singular inappropriateness of waging a pro-liquor crusade on the basis of religion and morality was soon perceived, and it was decided to abandon sentimental professions and appeal to Democratic partisan prejudices. This assumption that the party was fundamentally a whiskey party aroused the resentment of many prominent Democratic leaders, which was all the stronger since the last Democratic State platform had declared that "the views of any citizen upon the question of Local Option" should not "interfere with his standing in the Democratic party." United States Senator John H. Reagan, ex Senator S. B. Maxey, Congressmen Culberson and Lanham, ex-Congressman Herndon and others pronounced for the Amendment. "In every community," wrote Senator Reagan, "we find men, once honored and respected, reduced to poverty, wretchedness, and dishonor, spending their money and time in drinking saloons, wives weighed down with grief and sorrow and want, and heartbroken and helpless children growing up in ignorance, beggary and vice, because husbands and fathers have been made drunkards and vagabonds by patronizing the drinking saloons. Millions of dollars are invested in this business of making men drunkards and in producing the desolation and ruin of women and children, which if employed in agricultural, manufacturing or commercial pursuits, and directed by the talents and time wasted in these drinking houses, would add untold millions to the aggregate wealth of the State, and make as many thousands of happy families as are now made miserable because this money and time are given to the selling and drinking of intoxicating liquors. In view of these facts, with all respect to the meeting at Austin and its committee, I must express my regret that any effort has been made to make a party question of it; and especially do I regret that Democrats should seek to identify that great and grand historic party with the fortunes and fate of whiskey-shops, drunkards and criminals."

---

[1] The editor is indebted to J. B. Cranfill of Waco, Tex.

But the methods of the Prohibitionists in the campaign were defensive. Their energies were directed chiefly toward competing with the rumsellers for Democratic influence. Proffers from the North were rejected; the help of the women was not invited;[1] the strongest efforts were made in the cities and the rural districts were neglected, and sufficient attention was not given to cultivating the support of the very large negro element. On the other hand the anti-Prohibitionists (under the management of George Clark, a shrewd Democratic leader, who, it was alleged by Thomas R. Bonner, received $50,000 for his services) made a very vigorous campaign. They worked in co-operation with the national liquor organizations which, since the narrow escape from defeat in Michigan, had manifested a determination to crush Prohibition in all subsequent contests.[2] They received a subscription of $5,000 from the United States Brewers' Association, and sent a committee to canvass for contributions in the Northern cities; and this committee raised large sums, obtaining, it was said, $50,000 in Chicago alone.[3] They made special exertions to win the colored vote, sending out Archibald Cochran (the Republican candidate for Governor in 1886) to work among the negroes. They placed no restraints upon their followers: the most vindictive language was indulged in, and Congressman Mills bitterly attacked the clergymen who were advocating the Amendment, declaring that "the political preachers" ought to be "scourged back to their pulpits." Prohibition meetings were broken up; at San Antonio, June 7, the venerable Bishop H. M. Turner (colored) of Georgia was mobbed and his audience was dispersed. The support of the leading daily papers was secured for the liquor cause by the payment of generous sums; the Dallas and Galveston *News*, principal daily of the State, was liberally patronized, an enormous quantity of anti-Prohibition matter being published in it at advertising rates[4] The only daily newspapers advocating the Amendment were the Waco *Advance* and *Day* and the Dallas *Times-Herald*, although all the religious and many of the country weeklies supported it. Very large meetings were held by both sides. Ten days before the election there was a mammoth State gathering of anti-Prohibitionists at Fort Worth, and to insure order at this great demonstration in favor of the drink traffic the sale of liquor on the grounds was rigidly prohibited and suppressed. The greatest sensation of the campaign was produced on this occasion, a letter from Jefferson Davis against Constitutional Prohibition being read. His argument was based on opposition to paternal governments, the belief that "the world is governed too much," the conviction that legitimate personal rights would be interfered with by Prohibition, the opinion that legislation should be directed against the abuse and not the use of liquor, and the belief that a Prohibitory law could not be enforced.[5] A marked effect was produced by the Davis letter.

The vote by counties on the Prohibitory Amendment stood as follows:

	PROHIBITION.	
COUNTIES.	Yes.	No.
Anderson	1,221	2,109
Angelina	420	665
Aransas	6	109
Archer	54	44
Atascosa	210	382
Austin	325	2,987
Bandera	236	428
Bastrop	774	2,479
Baylor	142	84
Bee	124	253
Bell	2,742	3,501
Bexar	773	6,344
Blanco	371	507
Bosque	1,207	1,494
Bowie	1,558	1,321
Brazoria	284	1,031
Brazos	898	1,965
Brewster	36	49
Brown	846	1,150
Burleson	814	1,560
Burnet	687	802
Caldwell	1,028	1,538
Calhoun	4	143
Callahan	376	391
Cameron	85	1,216
Camp	683	489
Cass	621	2,019
Chambers	107	224
Cherokee	1,459	1,828
Childress	28	16
Clay	321	395
Coleman	397	429
Collin	2,756	2,895
Colorado	743	2,876
Comal	27	1,264
Comanche	626	1,398
Concho	83	74
Cooke	2,073	1,973
Coryell	1,263	1,763
Crosby	35	16
Dallas	3,626	6,381
Delta	770	692
Denton	1,639	2,854
De Witt	415	1,709
Dimmit	61	53
Donley	34	84
Duval	17	283
Eastland	563	774
Edwards	72	116
Ellis	2,711	3,337
El Paso	211	1,866
Encinal		16
Erath	1,013	1,651
Falls	1,117	2,894
Fannin	4,071	2,910
Fayette	791	4,627
Fisher	77	54
Fort Bend	399	1,595
Franklin	421	749
Freestone	748	2,286
Frio	152	236
Galveston	1,206	2,561
Gillespie	59	1,186
Goliad	175	739
Gonzales	881	2,069
Grayson	3,991	4,147
Greer	21	24
Gregg	680	928
Grimes	1,017	2,668
Guadalupe	731	2,045
Hale	15	1
Hamilton	708	998
Hardeman	139	181
Hardin	228	309
Harris	1,515	4,323
Harrison	899	2,951
Haskell	73	75
Hays	883	954
Henderson	813	1,415
Hidalgo	6	435
Hill	2,562	2,695
Hood	680	589
Hopkin	1,655	2,003
Howard	86	112
Houston	1,088	2,179
Hunt	2,281	2,764

---

[1] The Texas Woman's Christian Temperance Union, however, led by Mrs. Jennie Bland Beauchamp and others, made independent exertions.

[2] The policy of these organizations was thus expressed by the Louisville *Weekly Bulletin*, a leading whiskey organ, April 13, 1887:

"If we carry Texas and Tennessee, and defeat the present state of affairs in Atlanta, we can then bid Prohibition defiance and go into Iowa and Kansas assured of re-establishing law and order where all is now confusion."

[3] See the *Voice*, June 23, 1887.

[4] This journal originated the policy adopted by newspapers in all the States subsequently voting on Prohibition, of refusing to print articles for or against Prohibition unless paid for doing so. The liquor men, having abundant funds, were able to control its columns.

[5] For the text of Jefferson Davis's letter, see "The Political Prohibitionist for 1888," p. 145.

	Prohibition.			Prohibition.	
Counties.	Yes.	No.	Counties.	Yes.	No.
Jack	495	740	Presidio	1	395
Jackson	193	313	Rains	275	387
Jasper	144	668	Red River	1,885	2,052
Jeff Davis	22	78	Reeves	54	73
Jefferson	169	512	Refugio	13	133
Johnson	2,127	2,161	Robertson	1,423	3,219
Jones	269	65	Rockwall	459	544
Karnes	120	294	Runnels	234	160
Kaufman	2,140	2,249	Rusk	1,291	2,494
Kendall	64	636	Sabine	256	188
Kerr	252	370	San Augustine	336	713
Kimble	145	207	San Jacinto	222	860
Kinney	39	256	San Patricio	8	79
Knox	72	41	San Saba	527	389
Lamar	3,164	3,200	Scurry	53	12
Lampasas	762	797	Shackelford	144	124
La Salle	60	135	Shelby	924	1,177
Lavaca	591	2,393	Smith	1,719	2,939
Lee	447	1,473	Somervell	253	282
Leon	719	1,691	Starr	18	250
Liberty	223	460	Stephens	311	295
Limestone	1,432	2,528	Stonewall	16	8
Live Oak	73	213	Tarrant	3,136	2,833
Llano	417	626	Taylor	535	270
Madison	371	747	Throckmorton	102	40
Marion	390	1,336	Titus	587	758
Martin	32	47	Tom Green	192	512
Mason	331	491	Travis	2,421	4,104
Matagorda	114	514	Trinity	451	668
Maverick	25	420	Tyler	617	669
McCulloch	174	268	Upshur	885	1,259
McLennan	3,423	4,413	Uvalde	206	280
McMullen	45	71	Val Verde	91	180
Medina	128	842	Van Zandt	1,259	1,807
Menard	59	125	Victoria	229	1,178
Midland	82	28	Walker	528	1,392
Milam	1,615	2,778	Waller	385	1,533
Mitchell	184	148	Washington	1,592	3,430
Montague	1,173	1,660	Webb	56	694
Montgomery	803	1,059	Wharton	225	1,175
Morris	428	609	Wheeler	43	113
Nacogdoches	731	1,670	Wichita	129	146
Navarro	2,392	3,969	Wilbarger	187	118
Newton	123	448	Williamson	2,338	2,018
Nolan	142	75	Wilson	378	1,154
Nueces	171	796	Wise	1,522	2,321
Oldham	18	65	Wood	1,126	1,558
Orange	209	310	Young	336	361
Palo Pinto	509	619	Zapata		69
Panola	74	1,508	Zavala	61	46
Parker	1,461	1,684			
Pecos	4	74	Totals	129,270	220,627
Polk	398	1,059	Majority		91,357

Tennessee.

Though the Amendment election in Tennessee was held only eight weeks after the great defeat in Texas and was materially affected by that result, it was not productive of a proportionately large anti Prohibition majority, or one commensurate with the expectations of the liquor men. The campaign of the opposition was just as unscrupulous and corrupt as in Texas, and the various influences for controlling the popular verdict were manipulated with well-nigh equal success. But the Prohibition canvass was made under more favorable conditions; the temperance organizations were stronger; the work of education and agitation in behalf of personal temperance and against the saloon had been more thoroughly done; the smaller area of the State gave better opportunities for systematic management of the contest, and the benefits of the "Four Mile" Prohibitory law had prepared the people for more radical action.

After several years of unavailing agitation for the submission of a Constitutional Amendment, the Prohibitionists persuaded the Legislature of 1885 to take the initial step, and the next Legislature, in 1887, completed the work, appointing the 29th of September, 1887, as the day for the election.[1] The State Temperance Alliance (J. H. Fussell, President, and the State Woman's Christian Temperance Union (Mrs. Lide Meriwether, President) were the active forces supporting the Amendment in the campaign. The brunt of the canvass was borne by the trained Prohibition workers, and there was no discrimination against Northern sympathizers. Valuable help was given by leaders like Miss Willard, A. A. Hopkins, Sam Jones, George W. Bain, C. N. Grandison and Senator Colquitt. But some assistance was received from eminent public men of Tennessee, like A. S. Colyar, editor of the Nashville *American*, and ex-Supreme Judges East, Campbell and Freeman. Governor Taylor expressed his intention to vote for the Amendment, but made no effort in its behalf. Most of the leading newspapers were violently opposed to it (particularly those published in Memphis), although the chief Democratic organ, the Nashville *American*, was neutral. The principal Republican journal, the Nashville *National Review*, was intolerantly hostile.

The anti-Prohibitionists were under the leadership of George S. Kinney, President of the State Liquor-Dealers' Association. The United States Brewers' Association donated $8,000 to their campaign fund, and the National Protective Association, at a meeting held in Cincinnati two weeks before the election, appropriated $15,000. Very few public meetings were held by the Amendment's opponents, but their secret work, especially among the leaders of the colored men, was perseveringly and shrewdly done. The Knoxville *Journal* (Rep.) circumstantially charged that Mr. Kinney offered a Republican Congressman $5,000 for his influence; and the Democratic Collector of Internal Revenue at Nashville compelled all his employees to contribute to the anti-Prohibition campaign fund. Prominent lawyers and politicians were also persuaded to perform special services. Col. J. J. Vertrees, a well-known member of the bar, and State Treasurer Atha Thomas published artful appeals against Prohibition on revenue grounds.

One of the most striking incidents of the contest was the publication of the following, signed by 400 convicts of the State Penitentiary:

> "*To the Voters of the State of Tennessee:*
>
> "In all ages in the history of mankind, crises, reformations and revolutions have been the direct result of practical experiences by the human family.
>
> "One of these experiences has taught the people of the State of Tennessee that their prisons are filled, their poorhouses occupied and their paupers created by the direct influences of that soul-destroying demon, Whiskey. We, the inmates of the State Penitentiary, knowing by observation and convinced by undeniable facts that liquor is the cause of all the misery we endure, of all the hardships and privations we subject those to dependent upon us, do hereby most earnestly ask that the voters of this great State may seriously consider the question before them and give their aid in word and deed to the cause of Prohibition.
>
> "We do not say that every prisoner in the State is an habitual drunkard. We do not claim that every criminal act was perpetrated under the influence of whiskey; but we fearlessly assert that three-fourths in these walls can trace their downfall directly or indirectly to that cause.

---

[1] Both Legislatures had large Democratic majorities. The vote on submission in 1885 stood: Senate, 20 yeas to 11 nays; House, 57 yeas to 20 nays. In 1887 the vote stood: Senate, 30 yeas to 2 nays; House, 87 yeas to 4 nays.

> "Wearing the garb of disgrace, being dishonored and counted unworthy to mingle with the people of our State, we yet have the same devotion to our mothers, the same affection for our sisters; and for their sake and for the sake of our children we appeal to you to unite as one man and free the State from a curse created by the hands of men, discountenanced by the law of God."

The table below shows the vote by counties:

	Prohibition.			Prohibition.	
Counties.	Yes.	No.	Counties.	Yes.	No.
Anderson	1,135	571	Lawrence	614	915
Bedford	2,186	2,232	Lewis	94	252
Benton	822	812	Lincoln	1,911	2,840
Bledsoe	417	327	Loudon	905	381
Blount	1,611	928	Macon	423	1,117
Bradley	1,282	720	McMinn	1,621	928
Campbell	1,080	602	McNairy	880	1,173
Cannon	486	945	Madison	2,152	2,532
Carroll	2,075	1,764	Marion	682	1,148
Carter	1,032	386	Marshall	1,833	1,510
Cheatham	302	1,160	Maury	2,756	3,523
Chestar	641	687	Meigs	450	648
Claiborne	782	484	onroe	1,210	791
Clay	281	755	Montgomery	1,312	3,626
Cocke	1,299	1,018	Moore	226	912
Coffee	714	1,641	Morgan	338	448
Crockett	1,453	1,154	Obion	2,277	2,577
Cumberland	384	365	Overton	444	1,299
Davidson	7,178	9,980	Perry	103	579
Decatur	400	703	Pickett	71	460
De Kalb	603	1,883	Polk	331	621
Dickson	641	1,519	Putnam	515	1,344
Dyer	1,652	1,661	Rhea	1,045	791
Fayette	1,393	2,653	Roane	1,073	1,001
Fentres	156	478	Robertson	1,237	2,245
Franklin	904	2,062	Rutherford	1,451	4,300
Gibson	4,178	1,819	Scott	447	513
Giles	2,118	3,045	Sequatchie	83	286
Grainger	890	789	Sevier	1,113	1,223
Greene	2,483	1,783	Shelby	4,550	10,574
Grundy	355	607	Smith	897	1.880
Hamblin	1,322	471	Stewart	578	1,303
Hamilton	3,054	4,177	Sullivan	1,870	1,005
Hancock	866	355	Sumner	1,481	2,387
Hardeman	1,072	2,035	Tipton	1,818	1,863
Hardin	1,170	1,346	Trousdale	366	682
Hawkins	1,637	1,194	Unicoi	333	196
Haywood	1,327	2,488	Union	662	1,006
Henderson	823	1,236	Van Buren	134	355
Henry	1,796	1,669	Warren	760	1,514
Hickman	741	1,676	Washington	2,211	816
Houston	437	507	Wayne	681	654
Humphreys	627	1,350	Weakley	2,510	2,128
Jackson	479	1,367	White	602	1,353
James	219	434	Williamson	1,414	2,814
Jefferson	1,587	1,012	Wilson	2,219	1,913
Johnson	492	589			
Knox	5,984	2,601	Totals	117,504	145,197
Lake	202	410	Majority		27,693
Lauerdale	1,317	1,898			

Oregon.[1]

Oregon, at the beginning of her history, enjoyed Prohibition for a period of five years—from 1843 to 1848. At various times before and after her admission as a State, unsuccessful attempts to procure Prohibitory measures were made by the Temperance Alliance and other organizations. In the Legislature of 1883 a bill for submitting a Prohibitory Amendment was introduced, but owing to a technical error it was withdrawn. The Legislatures of 1885 and 1887 voted for submission, the latter with but three dissenting votes (all Republicans). The temperance sentiment of Oregon had always been considered strong, and the result of the election was a surprise to many persons. It was, however, a perfectly natural consequence of irresistible influences. The Portland *Oregonian*, leading Republican organ, which had probably greater weight with the public of the State than all other newspapers combined, took most emphatic ground against the Amendment. The power of the *Oregonian* had been demonstrated in the political canvass of 1886, when it had bolted the Republican ticket because of the corruption of the party and had given its support to the Prohibition candidates. Although the State had always been reliably Republican, the *Oregonian's* attitude defeated the Republican nominee for Governor and increased the vote of the Prohibition party from 492 in 1884 to 2,700. At the same election the Chairman of the Republican State Committee, Joseph Simon, had sacrificed the interests of the decent elements of the party by deliberately "knifing" Hon. J. B. Waldo, Republican and Prohibition candidate for Judge of the Supreme Court, and causing the election of his Democratic opponent, who was a tool of the liquor men. This disgraceful act caused the *Oregonian* to say:

> "The Republican party has been betrayed by villainous leadership into an alliance with the liquor ring. It has been debauched and prostituted to the liquor ring's services. It must shake off that leadership, repudiate that alliance or go to its death. It cannot support the infamy of such associations. It will lose all its men of character, conscience and decency, and it will die ignominiously, as it deserves. Redeem the Republican party from the liquor ring! Disenthrall it, or let it die."

But in the Amendment campaign of 1887 the respectable *Oregonian* and the disreputable Simon united their energies against Prohibition. Simon was still Chairman of the Republican State Committee, and he used his position to help the liquor men. He controlled the distribution of the large fund brought into the State a short time before the election by an emissary of the Eastern liquor interests. Under his dexterous management the Republican counties gave a very large anti-Prohibition majority, although the vote of the counties that had gone Democratic in the June election of 1886 was nearly equally divided for and against the Amendment. It was charged that Simon opposed the Amendment on the distinct understanding that the liquor vote would be thrown for the Republican party in the Presidential year of 1888; and developments justified this charge.[2]

The Prohibition canvass was conducted by a State League, of which A. M. Smith was Chairman and G. M. Peirce was Secretary. The various temperance organizations gave cordial assistance. Numerous addresses were made by Oregon workers and by leaders from other States. The exclusion of ex-Governor St. John of Kansas from the campaign, at the demand of intolerant Republicans, caused much dissatisfaction. No important public meetings were held by the liquor men, but they had the services of some prominent persons, especially Abigail Scott Duniway. Characteristic liquor documents, specially appealing to the farmers, taxpayers and public generally, were abundantly distributed and frauds were committed at the polls. The election day was stormy and only a light vote was cast in places where there was an honest poll, the total being 47,931 as against 54,954 at the State election of 1886. Yet in the county of Multomah (containing the city of Portland) the vote was 9,476 as against only 7,964 for Congressman at the exciting contest of 1886.

---

[1] The editor is indebted to H. S. Lyman.

[2] In June, 1888, the Republican candidate for Congress received 7,407 plurality, and Harrison's plurality in November was 6,769. These pluralities were largely in excess of any that had been obtained in recent years by the Republicans in Oregon, even under very favorable conditions. In 1884 Blaine's plurality was only 2,256.

The vote by counties follows:

Counties.	Prohibition. Yes.	Prohibition. No.	Counties.	Prohibition. Yes.	Prohibition. No.
Baker	389	730	Linn	1,915	967
Benton	880	724	Malheur	149	226
Clackamas	849	1,239	Marion	1,498	2,036
Clatsop	468	1,101	Morrow	497	360
Columbia	186	356	Multomah	1,945	7,531
Coos	679	534	Polk	739	547
Crook	439	172	Tillamook	258	346
Curry	129	120	Umatilla	1,331	1,081
Douglas	890	1,067	Union	759	912
Gilliam	414	362	Wallowa	245	226
Grant	498	535	Wasco	790	1,260
Jackson	553	1,311	Washington	675	918
Josephine	184	556	Yamhill	1,180	1,077
Klamath	251	170			
Lake	160	214	Totals	19,973	27,958
Lane	1,023	1,260	Majority		7,985

West Virginia.[1]

The day of the Presidential election of 1888 was the day for deciding the question of Constitutional Prohibition in West Virginia. This has always been considered unfortunate by the Prohibitionists of that State. The Cleveland-Harrison campaign was very exciting there, and the strength of the two leading parties was so nearly equal that there was a difference between them of only 506 votes in a total of about 160,000. At the same time warm contests were waged for the State, Congressional, legislative and other offices. Naturally in this fierce partisan fight the interests of Prohibition were sacrificed. For other reasons there was not a fair trial of the question on its merits. Dissensions among the friends of Prohibition prevented an energetic and systematic campaign. Proper efforts were not made for securing the services of the best Prohibition workers from other States, and the demands of the Prohibition political canvass throughout the Union engaged well-nigh all the speakers of national reputation. On the other hand the anti-Prohibitionists were not only favored by conditions, but by abundant funds, aggressive work, corrupt practices, newspaper support and all the other agencies so industriously and successfully applied in the typical liquor campaigns against Constitutional Prohibition.

West Virginia's movement for submission began in 1880, and was originated and promoted by representatives of leading religious denominations of the State. The submission of the Amendment was due to the organization and activity of the Prohibition party. In the Democratic Legislature of 1887 the House promptly voted for submission by 55 to 10, but the Senate, while favoring the measure by a majority, refused to give the necessary two-thirds until the Prohibition managers threatened to pass a statutory law granting complete Prohibition, when the obstructionists permitted the submission resolution to go through.[2]

A "non-partisan League" was organized, after considerable discussion, to manage the Prohibition campaign; but practically no support was given to it by the Republicans and Democrats who had strenuously demanded its creation, and it did no important work. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union was the most serviceable organization, employing able speakers. But no very large public meetings were held, and the general feeling was apathetic. The liquor managers used money corruptly.[3] After the election (Nov. 10) *Bonfort's Wine and Spirit Circular*, the leading national organ of the whiskey-sellers, said:

> "During months past tons of literature have been scattered broadcast over the State, and scarcely a county but has heard a public speaker for our cause, and, wherever possible, a joint debate. For this result, as in each of those preceding it, the trade owes a lasting debt of gratitude to the National Protective Association, and to the gentlemen who have so admirably directed its affairs."

The Wheeling *Intelligencer* (Rep.) and *Register* (Dem.), the chief dailies of the State, fought the Amendment unscrupulously, and comparatively few of the country weeklies favored it. The newspapers generally were corrupted by saloon money. The Parkersburg *Freeman*, State organ of the Prohibition party, was the principal supporter of the cause. An attempt was made to analyze the vote. Since the Amendment question was printed on the party ballots, it was possible to ascertain, by keeping a tally at each polling place, how the Republicans and Democrats stood concerning it. At the direction of the Prohibition State Committee, tallies were kept at 43 precincts in 28 different counties, representing about one-twelfth of the vote of the State. Of the 5 283 Democratic voters in these 43 precincts, 2 004 were for the Amendment 2,168 against it and 1,121 did not vote either for or against. Of the 5 502 Republican voters, 1,967 supported the Amendment, 2.316 opposed it and 2,316 ignored it.

The vote in detail is given in the following table:

Counties.	Prohibition. Yes.	Prohibition. No.	Counties.	Prohibition. Yes.	Prohibition. No.
Barbour	457	1,919	Lewis	1,075	1,271
Berkeley	975	2,030	Lincoln	225	1,062
Boone	...	....	Logan	101	266
Braxton	1,032	1,246	Marion	1,427	2,319
Brooke	928	691	Marshall	1,504	2,275
Cabell	1,398	1,877	Mason	1,297	2,365
Calhoun	411	720	Mercer	425	780
Clay	406	296	Mineral	610	1,071
Doddridge	547	1,431	Monongalia	1,049	1,732
Fayette	1,332	1,850	Monroe	713	1,047
Gilmer	533	1,007	Morgan	394	800
Grant	352	790	McDowell	....	....
Greenbrier	811	1,999	Nicholas	1,030	537
Hampshire	163	1,960	Ohio	1,620	6,951
Hancock	527	321	Pendleton	253	1,332
Hardy	247	1,154	Pleasants	413	742
Harrison	1,500	2,329	Pocahontas	330	813
Jackson	1,069	1,842	Preston	1,321	2,538
Jefferson	1,026	1,939	Putnam	970	1,246
Kanawha	2,720	3,350	Raleigh		....

---

[1] The editor is indebted to Dave D. Johnson of Parkersburg, W. Va.

[2] The Legislature of 1887 was Democratic in both branches—in the Senate by 14 to 12 and in the House by 36 to 29. Of the 16 votes against submission cast in the two branches, 13 were given by Democrats and 3 by Republicans. The stubborn fight was due to the great fear of the liquor men that the Amendment would be ratified if sent to the people. It will be remembered that the West Virginia submission struggle was made before the votes of Michigan, Texas, Tennessee and Oregon had given new courage to the traffic.

[3] See the *Voice*, Dec. 27, 1888.

	PROHIBITION.	
COUNTIES.	Yes.	No.
Randolph.....	253	1,661
Ritchie........	1,305	1,543
Roane.... ...	852	1,315
Summers	462	1,301
Taylor	684	1,631
Tucker	385	527
Tyler	773	1,435
Upshur	1,085	1,108
Wayne	835	1,416
Webster	230	524
Wetzel........	958	2,267
Wirt	578	1,015
Wood	2,075	2,528
Wyoming.....	222	386
Totals	41,668	76,555
Aggregate		118,223
Majority......		 34,887

New Hampshire.

For a generation New Hampshire had been under a partial and defective Prohibition law before any recognition of the appeals made by its friends for more stringent provisions was vouchsafed by the political rulers of the State. The statutes, while prohibiting the common sale of intoxicating beverages, permitted the manufacture. Under this peculiar measure several extensive brewing establishments flourished, and in time they became exceedingly powerful in State politics. Remarkable and conflicting conditions prevailed. Though unable to establish thorough Prohibition the temperance people were able to compel the retention of the old law, and one of the most extreme Prohibition advocates of the entire country (Henry W. Blair) was sent to represent New Hampshire in the United States Senate. They were also strong enough to command tolerably satisfactory enforcement of the law in nearly every community excepting a few cities. On the other hand, wherever any real advantage was sought by the Prohibitionists the liquor influence seemed to be omnipotent. At one session of the Legislature a deputation of ladies advocating certain amendments was received with great discourtesy, and members of the legislative committee filled the room with tobacco smoke while the ladies presented their case. It was a curious fact that while New Hampshire was intensely Republican her wealthiest Democratic liquor manufacturer (Frank Jones) had an influence with the Legislature outweighing that of the best elements of citizens. The explanation of Mr. Jones's successful opposition to further Prohibitory legislation was significantly hinted at in testimony which he gave in the famous bribery investigation of 1887. "Men are a good deal like hogs," said Mr Jones in that testimony; "they don't like to be driven. But you throw them down a little corn and you can call them most anywhere."

In New Hampshire the Legislature has no power to propose Amendments to the Constitution, and such Amendments can be submitted only by Constitutional Conventions held not oftener than once in seven years. A two thirds vote of the people is required to ratify and adopt an Amendment. Therefore the Prohibitionists of the State in their efforts to improve the law were forced to appeal to the Legislature for statutory action. The Legislature of 1887 was asked to pass an act prohibiting the manufacture of liquor, but although the Republican State Convention of 1886 had made warm professions of loyalty to the Prohibition cause, the bill against the manufacture was defeated. In January, 1889, the Constitutional Convention met, and the Prohibitionists appealed to it to submit an Amendment providing for complete Prohibition. Such an Amendment was accordingly submitted (Jan. 10). A campaign organization of Prohibitionists was effected soon afterwards, with George A. Bailey as Chairman. The different elements of Prohibitionists worked in harmony in the canvass. Chairman Bailey claimed that three-fourths of the 600 clergymen in the State were "actively engaged" in behalf of the Amendment. Governor elect D. H. Goodell was a prominent speaker for it, and even so shrewd a Republican politician as Senator William E. Chandler wrote a letter endorsing it. It was commonly known that the fund used by the liquor people aggregated $100,000. But they held only one small public meeting, which was addressed by William P. Tomlinson, a Democratic editor from Kansas. The most notable feature of the discussion in the press was upon the cider-exemption clause of the Amendment. This clause had been inserted at the instance of some Prohibitionists who thought votes would be gained among the farmers by discriminating in favor of cider, and who reasoned that the Legislature could afterwards suppress the alcoholic cider traffic by statute, as the Maine Legislature had done. But by making this exemption the Prohibitionists introduced a confusing element into the contest, were forced upon the defensive and lost many votes. Although some of the newspapers refrained from offensive hostitity, the behavior of the press in general clearly showed that much of the money of the liquor managers had been placed in the newspaper offices.

We give below the county votes.

	PROHIBITION.	
COUNTIES.	Yes.	No.
Belknap	1,593	1,568
Carroll	1,375	1,234
Cheshire	2,023	2,381
Coos	1,317	1,144
Grafton.......	2,745	3,023
Hillsborough..	4,956	7,358
Merrimack....	3,769	4,327
Rockingham..	3,301	5,113
Strafford	3,460	3,303
Sullivan	1,247	1,520
Totals	25,786	30,976
Aggregate	....	56,762
Majority	....	5,190

Massachusetts.

A long and eventful struggle preceded the Massachusetts campaign of 1889 for Constitutional Prohibition. In this struggle it was repeatedly demonstrated that the intelligent classes desired Prohibition by a strong majority; and more than once it was found that an actual majority of all the voters expressing themselves (even allowing for the ignorant and vicious classes and the whole saloon element) was opposed to the license system. But this powerful sentiment, though directed by excellent organizations and devoted individuals, achieved only local, imperfect and temporary successes. The best citizens of Massachusetts, and even the majority of all the citizens, though sentimentally preferring Prohibition were unable to cope with the artful liquor power and were forced to accept laws upon which the ingenuity of anti-Prohibition politicians had been expended. In the 20 years from 1869 to 1889, three different systems of liquor legislation were established—the Prohibitory statute of 1869, repealed in 1875, the Local Option and license act that was passed soon afterwards, and the High License and Limitation law of 1888 (in force May 1, 1889).

After the repeal of the Prohibitory law, all the legislation enacted was cleverly devised for satisfying the moderate temperance elements of the State. The Local Option and license combination answered this purpose perfectly. It enabled the people of every town and city annually (the towns in March and the cities in December) to declare by majority vote whether licenses should be granted within their respective limits. More than once the aggregate vote of the communities on the license question (even including the results in the large cities) showed a majority against the traffic; and the sentiment in favor of banishing the saloon was so general that four-fifths of the communities annually refused to grant licenses.[1] The normal sentiment of Massachusetts was therefore decidedly favorable to Prohibition; yet the very policy that invited its radical expression in the various localities operated to discourage exertion for the complete redemption of the State. It was argued that the people already had power to stop the traffic, and the conservative citizens manifested comparatively little favor for more advanced demands. Meanwhile the politicians made further concessions, granting a Metropolitan Police law for the city of Boston, prohibiting the sale of liquors on all public holidays, prohibiting the sale in tenement buildings, requiring the rumsellers to remove screens and other obstructions to a full view of their premises from the street, etc. Finally, in 1888, the law establishing a minimum annual license rate of $1,300 for each saloon selling all kinds of liquors for consumption on and off the premises was passed, and the same Legislature enacted another statute limiting the number of saloons to one for each 500 of the population in Boston and one for each 1,000 inhabitants in every other community These two statutes were not to go into effect until May 1, 1889, and meanwhile, in December, 1888, the cities were to vote on the local question of license, and the towns were to vote on the same question in March, 1889. The results of the city votes fully confirmed the expectation that the general public would accept the bribe held forth by the High License act; for there was a very strong reaction against locally prohibiting the issuance of licenses. This reaction encouraged the political managers in the Legislature of 1889 to at last grant to the people the often-refused privilege of voting on a Prohibitory Amendment.

It seems absolutely certain that if compromise measures had not been enacted in Massachusetts, the demand for Constitutional Prohibition would have proved irresistible long before the carefully laid schemes for defeating it were perfected. At one legislative session (1883) petitions for Constitutional Prohibition from 50,000 citizens were presented, and at another session (1884) the petitions had 106.000 signatures attached. In consequence of the evasive action of successive Republican Legislatures, the vote of the Prohibition party increased from 1,881 in 1883 to 10,947 in 1887, and some of the most distinguished and devoted temperance Republicans of the State (including Mary A. Livermore and Henry H. Faxon) openly rebelled against the faithless party. If the Republicans had not been able to point to their Local Option legislation, to Prohibitory conditions in four-fifths of the towns and to stringent restrictive acts, they could not have prevented a vote on Constitutional Prohibition when the temperance forces were eager for a contest and before counteractive devices had been set up.

As it was, the Republican leaders found it necessary to make very plausible professions of friendship for the temperance cause. Their State Convention for 1886 (Sept. 29) declared:

> "Believing, also, that whenever a great public question demands settlement an opportunity should be given the people to express their opinion thereon, we favor the submission to the people of an Amendment to our Constitution prohibiting the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors to be used as a beverage."

In 1887 a more elaborate utterance was made, as follows:

> "Recognizing in intemperance the most fruitful source of pauperism, crime, corruption in politics and social degradation, we affirm our belief in the most thorough restriction of the liquor traffic and the enforcement of law for its suppression. We approve the action of the last Legislature in enacting so many temperance statutes, and demand the continued enactment of progressive temperance measures as the policy of our party. We repeat the recommendation of last year's Convention as follows: 'Believing that this great public question now demands settlement, we favor the submission to the people of an Amendment to our Constitution prohibiting the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors to be used as a beverage.' In order to have this matter placed before the people, we call upon those who are opposed to the political control of the grog-shops to unite with the Republican party in electing Senators and Representatives who will vote for the submission of the Amendment."

But the crowning deliverance of the Republicans of Massachusetts was that emanating from the State Convention held on April 26, 1888, to choose delegates to the National Convention. It was:

> "The Republican party of Massachusetts has committed itself in favor of pronounced and progressive temperance legislation. It has demanded the restriction of the liquor traffic by every practicable measure, and now it calls upon the National Republican Convention to recognize the saloon as the enemy of humanity; to demand for the people the privilege of deciding its fate at the ballot-box; to insist that it shall be crippled by every restraint and disability which local public sentiment will sanction; in short, to take that attitude upon the temperance question which will win to the party all foes of the liquor traffic and all friends of good order."

The popular vote on the Constitutional Amendment, taken under the circumstances to which we have briefly alluded, was necessarily farcical. It was shown by the Boston *Transcript* (April 18, 1889) that of the 29 Senators and 161 Representatives voting to submit the Amendment in the Legislature of 1889, only 18 Senators and 91 Representatives were sufficiently friendly to the principle of Prohibition to vote for the measure at the polls. The same Legislature that passed the submission resolution refused to pass a Prohibition statute and even refused to enact a law permitting women to vote on the license question. The controlling Republican influences were skilfully directed against the Amendment, and the Democratic party was openly hostile. The Boston dailies espoused the liquor cause with great ardor. The *Globe* (Dem.), *Transcript* (Rep.) and *Herald* (Ind.) were especially violent opponents of Prohibition. The *Globe* gave much prominence to false reports from Kansas and Iowa, printing with great display letters from a few unimportant newspaper editors of those States who were willing to represent that Prohibition was a failure, and suppressing the abundant testimony to the contrary. The *Transcript* made a pretended canvass of the clergymen of Massachusetts, and claimed that they were about equally divided for and against the Amendment, although a canvass conducted with impartiality showed that of 1,039 clergymen expressing themselves, 931 were for the Amendment, 91 were against it, and 11 were non-committal. The Boston *Journal* (chief Republican organ), though nominally neutral, was inclined against the Amendment, and compelled the Prohibitionists to pay advertising rates for arguments appearing in its columns from the pen of Dr. Daniel Dorchester; and in printing these arguments it editorially disavowed responsibility for them. Indeed, all but one of the leading Boston newspapers refused to insert articles favorable to Prohibition unless exorbitant charges were paid. The only Boston daily supporting the Amendment was the *Traveller* (Rep.). Great clamor was made on the score that the adoption of Constitutional Prohibition would prevent the farmers from manufacturing cider for vinegar; and although the Attorney-General printed an official declaration that no such effect would follow, the cider argument was diligently used until the end of the campaign. The liquor managers employed canvassers who obtained numerous signatures from prominent clergymen, lawyers and business men, to anti-Prohibition declarations. A clergymen's "protest," signed by upwards of 60 ministers, was printed a few days before the election. The less earnest temperance people were discouraged from supporting the Amendment by the attitude of one of the representative religious organs of New England, the Boston *Congregationalist*, which on Feb. 21 printed an elaborate editorial article distinctly unfriendly in tone. The *Congregationalist's* course was repudiated by an authoritative meeting of Congregational clergymen; but that journal's arguments, seconded by pleas against the Amendment from several eminent divines, had much weight with undecided voters. The anti Prohibition lawyers argued that the success of Constitutional Prohibition would tend to diminish the respect in which the Constitution was held; and it was claimed that the lawyers' protest had the approval of well-nigh all the leading members of the bar. The argument was answered in withering language by United States Senator George F. Hoar; and a canvass instituted among the lawyers of the State showed that a large majority of them, outside of the city of Boston, favored the Amendment.

---

[1] For figures, see the the editor's postscript to the article, LOCAL OPTION.

The saloon element judiciously took no active part openly in the canvass. Having the support of so many prominent men and of the leading newspapers, the liquor-dealers were shrewd enough to recognize that their interests would be jeopardized by conducting a whiskey-sellers' agitation. Bowler Bros., brewers, of Worcester, in a retrospective letter written to a Nebraska correspondent in 1890, said that the experience of "the trade" in Massachusetts had demonstrated the wisdom of refraining from public discussion. "We should advise you," they wrote, "not to hold any public meetings, as those very good Prohibitionists won't attend them, and you will have the hall filled with a gang of loafers which will make you look like State's prison birds, and the papers will come out the next day with 'A man is known by the company he keeps.'"[1] But the whole anti-Prohibition campaign was really managed by the liquor-sellers exclusively. It was under saloon auspices that the various protests against Prohibition were invited, grouped together and effectively used. The State was literally sown with misleading documents prepared and circulated by the National Protective Association. The falsest statements about the results of Prohibition were coined and kept before the public. Meanwhile the virtues of High License and Local Option were dwelt upon by every person interested in the liquor business. The following, emanating from the saloon managers and published with great prominence just before the election, is a specimen of the appeals:

> "NO. On Monday next, April 22, the contest takes place between our present High License law, embodying Local Option on the one hand, and Constitutional Prohibition of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages, including CIDER, on the other hand. In the light of former Prohibitory experience, and in the interest of the cause of temperance, respect for our laws, reverence for our State Constitution, commercial prosperity and moderate taxation, every citizen having these considerations at heart should go to the polls and vote NO."

The campaign of the Prohibitionists was under the direction of a non-partisan State Committee, of which E. H. Haskell was Chairman, and Benjamin R. Jewell was Secretary. The different Prohibition organizations co-operated harmoniously. Nearly all the leaders of the Prohibitionists in the country took part in the contest.

Below is presented the vote by counties:

	PROHIBITION.	
COUNTIES.	Yes.	No.
Barnstable....	1,738	920
Berkshire	2,884	5,301
Bristol	6,645	7,171
Dukes....	354	73
Essex..........	11,426	18,287
Franklin......	2,366	2,711
Hampden	4,720	7,334
Hampshire....	2,859	2,756
Middlesex.....	17,621	23,558
Nantucket....	170	213
Norfolk.	5,330	6,964
Plymouth.....	4,872	4,768
Suffolk	12,207	33,686
Worcester	12,050	17,320
Totals	85,242	131,062
Majority.........		45,820

Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania's majority against Constitutional Prohibition seems colossal; but nearly one-half of it was contributed by the single county of Philadelphia, and nearly three-fourths by the three counties of Philadelphia, Allegheny and Berks, while the whole huge majority of 188,027 came exclusively from the eight counties of Philadelphia, Allegheny, Berks, Lancaster, Montgomery, Lehigh, Northampton, Schuylkill and Montgomery—counties containing large cities which were carried for the saloon by the most corrupt and unfair practices. The other

---

[1] The *Voice*, May 8, 1890.

59 counties, taken as a whole, showed a majority for the Amendment, although a number of important cities were embraced within them and unscrupulous and diligent resistance was everywhere made by the liquor leaders. Under the extraordinary conditions, the large total vote for the Amendment and the preponderance of Prohibition sentiment in 59 of the 67 counties were the really significant results of the contest.

The preference of the people for Prohibition when the issue was presented on its merits was shown both before and after the war. In 1843 local Prohibitory measures were enacted in obedience to the expressed desire of the people, and in 1873 42 of the 66 counties voted for Prohibition under the Local Option act of 1872. The political influence of the liquor element, however, caused prompt repeal in each instance. It is noticeable that the Local Option law was enacted soon after the organization of the Prohibition party in Pennsylvania. In the year of its repeal (1875) the vote of that party reached 13,244, although it had been only 4,652 in 1874. This exhibition of political independence by the Prohibitionists was short-lived, however, for in 1876 the party's vote dwindled to 1,319; and it remained unimportant until 1884, when St. John polled 15,283. It was not until after the Prohibition party had become an aggressive factor that there was any indication of willingness on the part of the politicians to listen to the demands of the friends of temperance. The Prohibition vote of 1884 was maintained at the unimportant State election of 1885; and in 1886 the Prohibitionists nominated for Governor the Independent-Republican leader, Charles S. Wolfe, and prepared for a vigorous canvass. Then it was that the Republicans began to make concessions. The Republican State Convention of 1886 declared:

> "*Whereas*, There is an evident desire on the part of a large number of intelligent and respectable citizens of Pennsylvania to amend the Constitution by inserting a clause prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks as a beverage within the limits of this commonwealth; therefore
>
> "Resolved, That it is the opinion and judgment of this Convention that the Legislature of the State should at once adopt measures providing for the submission of this great question to a vote of the people in accordance with the true spirit of our free institutions."

The political campaign of 1886 resulted in a vote of 32,458 for the head of the Prohibition ticket; and it was plainly seen that early defeat was in store for the Republicans unless the temperance issue were met. But the political leaders artfully resorted to compromise schemes. The Legislature of 1887 proposed a Prohibitory Constitutional Amendment, and then framed a High License and restrictive measure, known as the Brooks law, which, while leaving the traffic practically undisturbed in 65 of the 67 counties, was designed to effect a sweeping reduction in the number of saloons in the cities of Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and Allegheny and thereby satisfy conservative temperance sentiment and militate against the adoption of the Prohibitory Amendment at the polls after the work of submission should have been completed by the Legislature of 1889. (See High License.) The hostile purpose was crowned with complete success.

Having decided on this shrewd policy the Republicans, in 1887 and 1888, renewed their submission pledge of 1886; and in 1889 the State Legislature, Republican by a large majority in each branch, voted to submit the Amendment. The large vote cast by the Prohibition party in 1886 had meanwhile decreased more than one-third, and the politicians therefore felt that it was safe to proceed with their unscrupulous plans. With the opening of the legislative session of 1889, the active liquor men throughout the country began to exhibit great interest in the Prohibition struggle in Pennsylvania. They openly boasted that the Brooks law and the politicians would decide the contest in their favor. The situation as viewed from the liquor-sellers' standpoint was thus described in the regular Pittsburgh correspondence of *Bonfort's Wine and Spirit Circular* for Jan. 25:

> "Features in trade have been lost sight of at the present time, and the liquor men generally are absorbed in the question of Prohibition. . . . The dealers here have not yet taken any step toward effecting an organization, but a meeting will be held this week. There will be no foolishness this time. The line of action will be High License v. Prohibition. A committee will probably be appointed to confer with a similar representation from Philadelphia. Some dealers in this district were in favor of making an effort to have the Brooks law amended [*i. e.*, in the interest of the liquor traffic—Ed.], but they now see that this would be bad policy when the Prohibitory Amendment question has been forced to a verdict from the people.
>
> "Dealers here feel that if the campaign is properly conducted, there need be no fear but what the Amendment will be defeated. Temperance people are not a unit in favor of Prohibition by any means. They are already agitating the question, 'Is Prohibition what we want?' and many there are who answer in the negative, and cite the effects of Prohibition in Maine, Kansas and other places where it has been tried and proven most unsatisfactory to those who were responsible for its enactment.
>
> "Another thing must not be lost sight of in the opening of this campaign: the Republican party of Pennsylvania has not arrayed itself in favor of Prohibition. It has only promised to let the people have a vote on the question, and Capt. John F. Dravo, who has been delegated by the Republicans to take charge of the bill in the House, comes out in an interview in a Pittsburgh paper and says: 'There are many prominent Republicans, leaders in the party in this State, who, while voting in the Legislature for a submission of the question, will do all in their power to defeat it at the polls. This is their privilege, and in so doing their true loyalty to the Republican party will not be questioned. The Republican party is not pledged to Prohibition. It simply says this question can go to the people for a decision. If the matter is properly presented the intelligent people of this Commonwealth will probably vote No.'"

In the same issue of *Bonfort's Wine and Spirit Circular* the Philadelphia correspondent said:

> "As matters now stand, it is absolutely necessary for the entire trade to organize and get to work. Wake up, especially those who are always known as very generously permitting others to do the work. This time it is business; so each and every one lay aside any petty trade jealousies you may have. The enemy is strong, and to vanquish him requires good work, strong work, and work together, with your battle cry, 'High License against Prohibition.' Some dealers may not realize this condition of affairs in the trade, but all will very soon find out that, though the trade cannot now defeat Prohibition, High License can, as it will receive the support of a large majority of the press throughout the State, and the almost unanimous support of all fair-minded, sensible and practical men."

The secrets of the anti-Prohibition campaign were revealed by its chief manager, Harry P. Crowell, in a confidential interview with Col. R. S. Cheves, in March, 1890. The following is a portion of the interview, as published in the *Voice* for April 3, 1890.[1]

Crowell: "How did we begin the work? Well, I'll tell you. In the first place, we knew for the last three years that this fight was coming on, consequently we prepared for it.

"The first meeting of the liquor men was called to convene in Harrisburg, which was a failure. The second meeting was held in Philadelphia, and was a success, for at that meeting a State Executive Committee was selected and I was made Secretary with power to act and arrange for the fight. At that meeting plans were also adopted by which money could be raised. In the first place we assessed the sales of all beer per annum at ten cents per barrel. We levied an assessment of $1,000 on all the large hotels like the Continental, and they paid it like little men, and from $25 to $50 on all the smaller retail shops. Besides, each brewer was required to solicit money from all kindred interests—that is, every man in trade with whom they had dealings, those engaged in making barrels, those from whom we bought our horses, and wagons, and grain, and machinery, etc., were solicited to contribute to a campaign fund, and if such persons failed after a reasonable time to do so, a notice was forwarded intimating that a prompt compliance would save trouble and a possible boycott, thus forcing hundreds to help us who did it reluctantly. By this plan we raised over $200,000 which was expended by the State Committee.[2] Besides, local committees in every community raised and expended large sums during the campaign and on election day. Appeals for money were made to the trade throughout the country, and large sums were contributed by the Brewers' Association and the National Protective Association."

Cheves: "How did you dispose of this immense amount of money?"

Crowell: "Besides the current expenses, we paid it out to the newspapers, politicians, and some for literature and some for public speakers."

Cheves: "How did you manage to enlist the politicians on your side? Did you offer them money?"

Crowell: "Yes; we would go to the leaders, both Republicans and Democrats, and say, 'This is not a party fight and you cannot afford to be against us; if you do we will remember you at the next regular election, but if you will help us we will pay you liberally for your support.'

"Such State leaders as Bill Leeds, Charlie Porter, who is Chairman of the [Philadelphia] City Republican Committee, Cooper and Dave Martin, and others, and a lot of Democratic leaders we paid $500 apiece, and $200 apiece to local leaders, and $5 apiece to men who worked and manned the polls on the day of election.[3]

"Did I pay Quay any money? Yes; for three years he bled us, and our contributions to him came very near beating us at the polls. It was reported that we contributed money to defeat Cleveland, and the Democrats got hold of it and a plan was on foot to have the Democratic vote cast for the Amendment as a punishment to the Republican brewers of the State, and it would have succeeded if I had not found it out in time and 'fixed' the boys, but it cost us a big pile of money to do so. We had all the workers on our side, and the machines of both old parties were with us. We paid the County Commissioners of this county [Philadelphia] to let us have the poll-list exclusively for our use with the understanding that we were not to return the list until after the election. So the Prohibitionists, with no window-books, no money, no organization, had no show whatever against us."

Cheves: "Mr. Crowell, how did you manage to get the newspapers pretty much all on your side?"

Crowell: "Why, we bought them by paying down so much cash. I visited the editors in person or had some good man to do so, and arranged to pay each paper for its support a certain amount of money. Throughout the State we paid weekly papers from $50 to $500 to publish such matter as we might furnish, either news or editorial, but the city daily papers we had to pay from $1,000 to $4,000, which latter amount was paid to the *Times* of this city [Philadelphia]. Other papers we could not buy straight out, consequently we had to pay from 30 to 60 cents per line for all matter published for us according to the circulation and ability of the paper. We paid the *Ledger* 40 cents per line and the *Record* we paid 60 cents per line, though it did some good work for us for nothing. It was understood with most all of the papers that we would furnish the matter, and so we employed a man to write for us and prepare articles for publication which would be furnished to the papers to be printed as news or editorial matter, as we might direct. The most effective matter we could get up in the influencing of votes was, that Prohibition did not prohibit, and the revenue, taxation, and how Prohibition would hurt the farmers. We would have these articles printed in different papers and then buy thousands of copies of the paper and send them to the farmers. If you work the farmers on the tax question you can catch them every time.

---

[1] An effort was made by the newspapers and the politicians implicated to discredit the interview, but Mr. Crowell, in a personal letter written to Col. Cheves before the publication of the interview (see the *Voice* for April 10, 1890), made references to particular features of the conversation that fully substantiated the truthfulness of Col. Cheves's report.

[2] Mr. Crowell meant by this statement that $200,000 was raised in the city of Philadelphia alone. In an explicit article in the Philadelphia *Press* for June 23, 1889 (evidently based on authentic information obtained from liquor headquarters), it was shown that Philadelphia's contribution to the anti-Prohibition campaign fund was $200,000. Undenied reports of the amounts raised in other quarters appeared from time to time during the Amendment campaign. According to the Pittsburgh *Commercial Gazette*, $35,000 was subscribed by the brewers of Allegheny County, and according to a Pittsburgh dispatch in the New York *Tribune* for May 29, 1889, an additional sum of $25,000 was contributed by the Retail Liquor-Dealers' Association of Allegheny County. A still more striking indication of the thoroughness with which the liquor traffic throughout the State was levied upon was afforded by a Scranton dispatch to the New York *Times* in May, 1889 in which the following was said: "In the little mining town of Archibald, nine miles north of Scranton, there are 13 saloons. Each of these places has been taxed $100 by the Liquor Committee. If $1,300 can be thus raised in that village it is easy to see what an enormous sum will be raised throughout the State. Then come the contributions from the outside and the effective work done by the National Liquor League."

In Philadelphia correspondence to the New York *Times*, May 6, 1889, it was charged that the brewers of New York City had been forced to contribute $100,000 to the Pennsylvania anti-Prohibition campaign fund, and the truth of this charge was practically admitted by Andrew Finck, a prominent New York brewer, in an interview in the *Voice* for May 9, 1889.

[3] Mr. Martin was openly in charge of the Republican anti-Prohibition work of the campaign in Philadelphia. In a letter, March 8, 1890, to William E. Johnson of Lincoln, Neb. (who had written to him as a representative Pennsylvania anti-Prohibition leader, for suggestions as to methods that should be used for defeating Constitutional Prohibition in Nebraska), Mr. Martin wrote in the characteristic style of a professional whiskey manager. "My advice to you," said Mr. Martin, "would be to see the President of the Liquor-Dealers' Association of the United States, as the Association will be able to furnish you documents to be distributed among the farmers and also among the religious people. As far as the politicians are concerned I would advise to take one from each party for each voting district, and by no means have any public discussion between advocates of Prohibition or anti-Prohibition. It is my opinion that if the liquor-dealers will take up the High License law and show its advantages as a revenue measure by distributing documents signed by fifty or one hundred of the best citizens of each county in the State favoring High License as against Prohibition, the best results will be obtained." Notwithstanding Mr. Martin's offensive participation in the Pennsylvania contest, he was subsequently appointed Collector of Internal Revenue for the Philadelphia district, by President Harrison.

Mr. Cooper, mentioned by Mr. Crowell as one of the politicians in the pay of the liquor-dealers, was Chairman of the Pennsylvania Republican State Committee, and had been one of the principal leaders who brought about the submission of the Prohibitory Amendment and the passage of the Brooks law. He, too, was appointed to a lucrative office by President Harrison.

Senator Quay, in the judgment of impartial observers, was responsible, more than any other politician, for the manipulations whereby the preliminaries for defeating the Amendment were so artfully arranged. From the beginning of the movement for submission in Pennsylvania Senator Quay's power was absolute in the Republican party. He controlled the three Republican State Conventions that pledged submission. It was known that he watched and directed every phase of legislative action on the Brooks bill. In the Amendment campaign a word from Senator Quay would have compelled Republican friendship, or at least fairness. But the leading Republican politicians especially identified with Senator Quay in the management of the party were active and unscrupulous opponents of Prohibition.

For particulars of the Republican-Democratic combination in Philadelphia against the Amendment, see the *Voice* for June 20, 1889.

"How did I get the names of farmers? Why, I got the poll-book in each town and hired some man who was well posted to select the names of every farmer and send them to me, and it was here we got in our best work; for with the politicians, the papers and the farmers you can always win. C. C. Turner, Secretary of the liquor-dealers' publishing house at Louisville, will mail you a list of the farmers in Nebraska. He is a bright fellow, and can do you much good in some ways; but don't let him try to manage the newspapers for you."

Cheves: "How did you manage, Mr. Crowell, to get so many ministers on your side?"

Crowell: "Oh, that is the easiest thing out. No, I did not go to the preachers as I did to the politicians, but I always found out a good man in the church who could work the preacher with but little trouble, for half of the preachers are cowards.[1] Then I hired, for so much a name, some old broken-down newspaper man or politician to go around with a petition and get the names of ministers and lawyers, which we published with fine effect. We talked High License all the time. Never try to defend the saloon; if so, you lose the influence of church members and ministers; but talk about the revenue, cider, taxation, and especially Prohibition don't prohibit, and clamor for High License. I had thousands of badges printed with High License and gave them out to poll-workers on election day and it had fine effect.

"Yes, we understood and agreed to the passage of the High License law before the Amendment was submitted, so that we could use it as a means to defeat Prohibition. And it was that and that alone that saved us. With all our money and political backing we could not have defeated the Amendment on any other plea than High License."

Cheves: "Mr. Crowell, has High License, which has reduced the number of saloons, reduced to any extent the consumption of liquor?"

Crowell: "No sir; on the contrary the consumption of liquor has increased; The sale of beer in this city has increased 20 per cent. the last year, and gradually increased every year since the adoption of the Brooks law. While the number of licensed saloons has been reduced under High License, unlawful drinking places have increased. At first the officers made an effort to enforce the law, but now it is a farce and no effort upon the part of the authorities to suppress illegal sales is being made. Yet I honestly believe High License is the only practical way in dealing with the traffic. I am sure it will help the business, make it more respectable by putting it in the hands of a better class of men.

"Yes, we had a few speakers, but as a rule they are no good. I think it is throwing money and time away on them, for all who go out to hear our speakers are generally on our side to start with. Yes, we had Kate Field, and paid her $250 and expenses per day, but she is no good—money wasted. We also had Rev. Sikes and Mr. Tomlinson of Topeka, but they are not worth fooling with. Let the speakers go. Get up good literature of your own, and send it especially to the farmers. Make a plea for High License and the battle is yours—that is, if you have the papers and politicians with you, and you can get them if you have the money.

"No, you need not go to Quay. He tries to be on both sides. It was reported during our campaign that he would vote for the Amendment. Our Committee investigated the report. Quay denied it and satisfied us that it was false. But all of Quay's strongest personal friends and supporters were with us beyond doubt, and, it was understood, with his approval. It was for that influence we contributed liberally to his support for three years.

"I never want to go through such another fight. It almost killed me. Besides, my business suffered greatly, for I was nearly three years with the burden of the fight on my shoulders, and for it all I was paid only $5,000, and some of the trade kicked about that.

"When the campaign closed we were in debt $50,000 on account of debts contracted with the newspapers, but the Committee made an appeal and raised the amount and settled all claims."

Immediately after the appearance of the Crowell interview, particulars of a lawsuit instituted in Philadelphia were published, which thoroughly confirmed the main assertions made by the anti-Prohibition manager. Moore & Sinnott, wholesale liquor-dealers of Philadelphia, sued Harry P. Crowell and the Pennsylvania State Brewers' Association for the sum of $22,800. In the Amendment campaign Moore & Sinnott had advanced $38,000 to the anti-Prohibition fund, with the understanding that this amount would be repaid—40 per cent. of it by the Liquor-Dealers' League and 60 per cent. by the State Brewers' Association. The $38,000 was advanced when the Anti-Prohibition Committee was short of money, and was applied for the following-mentioned purposes: $20,000 to the newspapers for "advertising"; $13,000 "to the window-book men engaged to work the polls," and $5,000 as a retainer to Lewis C. Cassidy (Democratic politician) "on account of the $20 000 promised him for his work in the campaign." Specifications of the amounts paid to particular newspapers were also made by Moore & Sinnott, as follows:

May 20, *Delaware County Citizen*	$500 00
May 25, Philadelphia *Inquirer*	1,504 52
June 7, *Catholic Standard*	175 00
June 15, *Catholic Standard*	150 00
June 15, *Commercial List*	187 25
June 17, Philadelphia *Record*	300 00
June 17, *Evening Bulletin*	500 00
June 17, Philadelphia *Inquirer*	776 00
June 17, *Evening Star*	225 00
June 20, Philadelphia *Ledger* (various bills)	145 30
June 24, *Evening Bulletin*	250 00
June 27, *North American*	2,942 20
June 27, Philadelphia *Inquirer*	208 10
June 27, Philadelphia *Times*	3,516 30
July 2, *Evening Telegraph*	4,000 00
July 2, *Evening Bulletin*	500 00
July 8, Philadelphia *Record*	2,182 00
July 15, Detective services	300 00
July 15, Extra work for city papers	575 00
July 15, Schuylkill *Navy*	280 00
Total	$19,216 67[1]

The circumstances thus made clear by testimony from anti-Prohibition sources were also defined by other indisputable evidence. Chairman Palmer of the State Amendment Committee, although a Republican in politics, on the night of the Amendment election explained the result by saying: "The defeat of the Prohibition Amendment in Pennsylvania was occasioned by the combined villainy of the Republican and Democratic machines, using every practice known to corrupt politics" In an interview in the *Voice* for June 20, 1889, Mr. Palmer used the following graphic language in speaking of the hostility and unfairness of the press:

---

[1] It must not be imagined that there was any general opposition to the Amendment among clergymen. As in all other States, a large majority of those expressing themselves favored Prohibition with great enthusiasm. To the hearty co-operation of the clergy the Prohibitionists owed much of the organized and active work that was done. But there were some notable exceptions. The Roman Catholic Archbishop in Philadelphia (Ryan) opposed the Amendment on High License and other conservative grounds, and the *Catholic Total Abstinence News* (organ of the Roman Catholic total abstinence societies) also opposed it, although earnest support was given by some Catholic pastors and laymen, particularly Martin I. J. Griffin of Philadelphia. Bishop Whitaker (Protestant Episcopal) of Philadelphia was understood to be inclined against Prohibition, and various influential clergymen throughout the State, in interviews or otherwise by example, gave encouragement to the anti-Prohibitionists. Very few clergymen, however, engaged actively in the anti-Prohibition work. Several men alleged to be of the cloth made speeches opposing the Amendment; but in most instances these individuals were of questionable reputation.

[1] This list represents only the sums paid to Philadelphia and two other newspapers out of the particular contribution provided by Moore & Sinnott—a single liquor firm. It is merely a partial list of sums expended for subsidizing the press. Throughout the State it was the policy of the liquor men to buy the columns of all newspapers that could be induced to print anti-Prohibition matter. The Easton *Daily Express*, having printed, during the campaign, an article that created false impressions, a correction was sent to its editor from the office of the New York *Voice*, and the following letter was received in reply:

"THE VOICE, New York.—The reply to the Philadelphia *Record*, which you sent us, we will have 'the fairness' to publish if you will remit or agree to pay 60 cents an inch for it, which is just the rate paid for the article (with an advt. mark to it), to which you refer. Business is business. The *Voice* is for Prohibition—for revenue, no doubt. We are in business to do business. Yours,

"THE EXPRESS.

"EASTON, PA., May 22, 1889."

> "The newspapers of the State, with few exceptions, have been nothing but common prostitutes. This language, in view of the truth, is not strong, but calm and gentle. I do not complain because they have opposed Prohibition, but because they have permitted the saloons to use their columns for the most shameful purposes—for systematically deceiving the people. They have printed bogus dispatches and unhesitatingly used what they knew was bogus matter in a way to mislead even newspaper men. If their editors deny this charge they deliberately write themselves down liars. They have printed articles manufactured right here in Philadelphia under the guise of honest dispatches from Des Moines, Topeka, Atchison and other places in Prohibition States, giving what pretended to be facts and figures, and asserting the failure of Prohibitory laws and the havoc wrought by them. These 'dispatches' have been printed in the ordinary way in the news columns, without any marks to distinguish them as paid matter; yet they have been paid for from the rum funds at so much per line, and this disgraceful work has been going on all over the State right along from the beginning of the campaign.
>
> "We have sent to the Prohibition cities and obtained from the highest authorities the most conclusive denials of the statements made in the bogus 'dispatches.' These denials we have carried to the newspapers that printed the false assertions, hoping that motives of decency and fairness would persuade the editors to make corrections. But their charge for doing justice was 50 cents a line, with the condition that each correction should appear with an advertising mark.[1]
>
> "We took some of these denials to the Philadelphia *Ledger*, George W. Childs's paper, and the best that the organ of that great philanthropist would do for us was to print them in the advertising columns under the head, 'Political Notices.' On the other hand, the *Ledger* has given two columns of the space on its editorial page to matter furnished by the liquor-dealers, which was inserted in such a way that even a newspaper man would not know that it was not genuine reading matter.
>
> "When we had our great meeting in this city, at which Governor Beaver presided and spoke, we had to pay the *Inquirer* $200 for a two-column report, the other papers giving the affair only meagre notices. Had it been an ordinary political meeting it would have been worth at least two columns to any paper as a matter of news.
>
> "Money, money, was what the newspapers greedily clamored for. I know of one daily paper in this city that stood ready to sell itself to the Prohibitionists for $10,000. 'Pay us $10,000 and we are yours; otherwise we go in for rum and all it is worth in dollars and cents. Come down with that $10,000, —— you, or we will lie about your cause, print all the dirty slanders that are furnished from liquor headquarters and play the deuce generally with Prohibition, and you shall have no redress or fairness from us, —— —— you, except at the rate of so much per line, advertising rates.' That is what this servant of the people and devotee of the noble art of journalism practically meant by its attitude."

The campaign of the Prohibitionists was begun under unfortunate circumstances. There were disagreements between the Republican temperance people and the party Prohibitionists, but the latter acted with forbearance and made sacrifices. The State Committee was headed by Henry W. Palmer, formerly Attorney-General of the State. It worked under great disadvantages, less than $5,000 being subscribed for its use. Good service was rendered, however, by county and local organizations. The only very notable meeting arranged by the State Committee was the one held in the Philadelphia Academy of Music, at which Governor Beaver presided. But much vigor and enthusiasm characterized the agitation in nearly all parts of the State. Valuable assistance was rendered by many of the foremost citizens. Especially noteworthy were the friendly utterances of T. V. Powderly, national head of the Knights of Labor; Judge John F. White, who had become famous throughout Pennsylvania by his rigid interpretation of the Brooks law in Allegheny County; ex-Chief-Justice Daniel Agnew, who contributed numerous important newspaper articles, and Postmaster-General John Wanamaker. The Philadelphia *Journal of United Labor*, national organ of the Knights of Labor, emphatically advocated the Amendment. The Prohibition papers of the State, led by the Scranton *People* and Philadelphia *Quill*, gave intelligent support.

The vote by counties was as follows:

	PROHIBITION.	
COUNTIES.	Yes.	No.
Adams	2,167	3,505
Allegheny	19,611	45,799
Armstrong	3,760	3,913
Beaver	4,751	3,221
Bedford	2,829	3,677
Berks	3,229	22,433
Blair	6,322	4,038
Bradford	6,903	3,498
Bucks	4,698	9,018
Butler	5,614	3,191
Cambria	2,758	4,190
Cameron	514	373
Carbon	1,530	3,882
Centre	4,589	2,654
Chester	8,415	6,723
Clarion	3,701	2,241
Clearfield	5,152	3,570
Clinton	2,135	2,181
Columbia	2,607	3,848
Crawford	7,518	4,014
Cumberland	3,779	4,422
Dauphin	5,062	8,737
Delaware	4,539	5,595
Elk	826	1,579
Erie	5,168	8,978
Fayette	7,154	4,142
Forest	843	414
Franklin	3,605	4,914
Fulton	543	1,142
Greene	3,143	2,831
Huntingdon	3,036	2,391
Indiana	4,966	2,067
Jefferson	4,076	2,452
Juniata	1,337	1,431
Lackawanna	7,889	9,896
Lancaster	7,290	18,271
Lawrence	4,486	1,588
Lebanon	1,460	6,752
Lehigh	1,779	11,684
Luzerne	11,145	14,967
Lycoming	4,556	5,681
McKean	3,054	2,058
Mercer	6,838	2,882
Mifflin	2,034	1,335
Monroe	970	2,585
Montgomery	4,638	14,358
Montour	1,199	1,621
Northampton	2,986	11,152
Northumb'rl'd	5,062	5,609
Perry	1,908	2,214
Philadelphia	26,468	118,963
Pike	260	969
Potter	1,575	1,546
Schuylkill	4,180	16,490
Snyder	947	2,359
Somerset	2,079	3,451
Sullivan	667	961
Susquehanna	4,781	2,305

---

[1] Particulars might be adduced in abundance. We cite a single instance:

The *Voice*, during the campaign, sent letters concerning the practical workings of Prohibition to all the County Probate Judges in Kansas. For 87 of the counties replies were received from Probate Judges, for seven counties from other county officials, for two counties from reliable private citizens and for one county from a former Probate Judge—making 97 of the 106 counties of Kansas from which answers to highly practical questions were returned. The *Voice* printed all the answers without discrimination, a few of them being more or less unfavorable to Prohibition in certain respects. The county of Comanche was one of the counties from which no reply was received. But Mr. Widaman, the Probate Judge of that county, a man opposed to Prohibition, wrote out unfavorable replies to the questions and had them published in an anti-Prohibition newspaper. Judge Widaman's report concerning Prohibition, standing by itself, was from any general point of view wholly insignificant. Comanche was a newly organized county of Kansas, casting less than a thousand votes at the Presidential election of 1888. Moreover it was more than probable, from Judge Widaman's tone, that he was not an unprejudiced observer. Yet the report made for this insignificant county by a manifestly biased man was eagerly reprinted by the intelligent editors in Pennsylvania as consequential evidence of the failure of Prohibition to accomplish its objects in practice. Meanwhile the remarkable replies produced by the *Voice* from 97 of the 106 Kansas counties were wholly ignored by the Pennsylvania newspapers, and it was impossible to induce any influential journal to convey to the public the results of this exceedingly interesting and apposite investigation until, just before the election, the Chairman of the State Amendment Committee by paying "advertising" charges had them inserted in the Philadelphia *Press*.

	Prohibition.	
Counties.	Yes.	No.
Tioga.....	4,713	3,637
Union.........	1,605	1,412
Venango	5,409	1,908
Warren........	3,532	2,672
Washington ..	6,762	4,757
Wayne.........	2,521	2,770
Westmoreland	8,292	8,184
Wyoming.....	2,259	1,041
York	6,341	11,407
Totals......	296,617	484,644
Majority....		188,027

TALLIE MORGAN.

Rhode Island's Repeal.

The movement for the repeal of the Rhode Island Prohibition Amendment was begun immediately after its adoption. It was made a part of the Constitution at the State election held April 7. 1886. The Legislature was to meet at Newport in May, and it was expected that suitable statutory legislation would then be passed. A bill was drawn up by a committee of Prohibitionists and presented in their behalf by Attorney-General Metcalf. The Republicans controlled the Legislature by 30 to 7 in the Senate and 64 to 8 in the House. It was not expected that any hostility or unfairness would be encountered, and the State was wholly unprepared for the complications that ensued. The Legislature enacted Mr. Metcalf's bill, adding to it a provision for a State Constabulary. This change was not seriously objected to by the temperance people, although they had refrained from asking for the new machinery lest opposition should be aroused on the score of expense. But when, immediately afterward, Gen. Charles R. Brayton, a lobbyist and a man of clouded reputation, supposed to be on intimate terms with the liquor element, was made Chief of the Constabulary, it was charged that the law was being used for personal and political purposes. Yet some Prohibitionists, hoping that Gen. Brayton would prove loyal to his trust, did not join in the demand for his retirement. Angry contentions followed, and in the confusion that reigned the merits of the demand for the honest enforcement of the Prohibitory act received comparatively little attention.

The public officials of the city of Providence, continuing the policy of comparative non-interference with the liquor traffic that they had observed under the license law, made no real effort to enforce Prohibition. Prohibitory law entered a city whose Mayor, Aldermen and even policemen of lowest grade recognized no obligation to enforce any liquor act, whatever its conditions. The city's prosecuting officer was so related to prominent liquor-dealers, both socially and as professional counsel in civil business, that, while possibly willing to prosecute cases actually forced upon him, he found it easy to point out to executive officers all risks, however improbable, that they were liable to encounter. Before the expiration of a single year the name of this prosecutor was appended to a memorial to the Legislature testifying that Prohibition was "incapable of enforcement." By every means available to him this very influential law officer did all in his power to discourage loyalty. Attorney-General Metcalf, though honestly desiring to do his duty, was delayed by appeals and exceptions and was unable, during his brief term of office, to obtain convictions. There was at no time an honest trial of Prohibition on its merits, except during the administration of Attorney-General Horatio Rogers (1888-9); and Mr. Rogers did not have the co-operation of the other officials or the cordial support of his party. Although Gen. Brayton resigned as Chief of State Police in 1887, and was succeeded by Edward F. Curtis (who was a more acceptable man), the new Chief, though better sustained by the Prohibitionists than Brayton had been, struggled against a defective statute which limited his powers and opportunities Throughout the period of Constitutional Prohibition in Rhode Island the Prohibitionists found themselves balked by the politicians at every step. They refrained from using retaliatory methods; the vote of the Prohibition party at State elections was suffered to decline from 2,585 in 1886 to 1895 in 1887 and 1,326 in 1888; and the partisan managers therefore found in the election returns no sufficient indication that their surrender to the liquor element would be attended by serious danger. On the other hand, the earnest Republican Prohibitionists endeavored to persuade their party to grant satisfactory amendments to the law, and much work was done by them within party lines, at times, apparently, with prospects of success; but the liquor Republicans were able to counteract their influence. The bitter and unscrupulous hostility of the press was another important element. Public opinion in Rhode Island was practically controlled by two powerful daily newspapers, the Providence *Journal* and *Telegram*, which fought the Prohibitory law with extreme rancor. Both the *Journal* and the *Telegram* magnified the violations of the law and attributed them to the Prohibition policy rather than to the perfidy of official and political conspirators. Yet it was declared by the chief law officer of the State, Attorney-General Rogers, that Prohibition could have been made a complete success if the authorities had shown any honest disposition to respect their oaths of office.[1]

We summarize briefly the chief developments following the enactment of the statute and preceding the repeal campaign:

1887.—At the State election in April the Republican party lost control of the State Government for the first time in 30 years Its defeat was due to the public disgust occasioned by controversies, and to other complications. Democratic success did not, however, signify a victory for the cause of enforcement, since the Democratic party was thoroughly committed to the liquor cause. The Democrats retained control until April, 1888, and during this year the liquor-dealers suffered little or no molestation.

1888.—The Legislature, at its January session, completed the preparations begun in 1887 for submitting to the people a Constitutional Amendment removing the restrictions on the franchise—restrictions against male foreign-born citizens and restrictions establishing a property qualification for voters. At the April election this Amendment (known as the Bourne Amendment) was adopted. At the same election the Republican party triumphed on a platform containing the following apparently aggressive declaration:

---

[1] The *Voice*, June 27, 1889.

> "The people of Rhode Island, acting in their sovereign capacity, have, by a Constitutional majority, added to their fundamental law Article 5, known as the Prohibitory Amendment. The Constitution which at any time exists, till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. For the maintenance of the integrity of the State and the preservation of good order, we recognize and emphasize that it is the duty of the General Assembly to make all needful laws for giving effectiveness to Constitutional provisions; and it is the imperative duty of all State, municipal and town executive officers faithfully, impartially, persistently and effectively to enforce said laws. To the making and enforcing of such laws we pledge ourselves as a party, and we denounce as hurtful to the best interests of the State all attempts to evade the laws and all compromise with law-breakers."

This was regarded as a pledge by the Republicans to enforce the law and to strengthen the statute by adding to it the features of the Kansas Injunction act; and the party managers, in consideration of continued support, made promises that were satisfactory to the temperance Republican leader, Henry B. Metcalf. The Legislature (Republican by 31 to 6 in the Senate and 61 to 11 in the House) met at Newport in May and refused to act upon the Injunction bill after it had been practically killed in the House (34 yeas to 31 nays) by the addition of an amendment providing for jury trials in all cases where questions of fact should be raised. At this session the bill authorizing the Chief of State Police to employ counsel in seizure cases was defeated, and a resolution for the resubmission of the Prohibitory Amendment was introduced. It was afterwards learned that the Legislature's behavior was due chiefly to the corrupt influences brought to bear by Gen. Brayton, whose services as a lobbyist had been secretly retained by the liquor men. In this year, as before stated, Attorney-General Rogers made his commendable efforts in behalf of enforcement.

1889.—The Injunction bill, with the damaging Amendment added in 1888, came up for final consideration in the Legislature in January. Although its virtue was practically destroyed, the temperance people thought it was worth fighting for. But it was indefinitely postponed in the House (Feb. 13), the vote standing: Yeas 46 (39 Republicans and 7 Democrats); nays, 25 (22 Republicans, 2 Democrats and 1 Prohibitionist); absent, 1 (a Democrat). The Legislature next voted to resubmit the Prohibitory Amendment. In the House the vote stood (March 8): Yeas, 41 (35 Republicans and 6 Democrats); nays, 25 (21 Republicans, 3 Democrats and 1 Prohibitionist); not voting, 6 (5 Republicans and 1 Democrat). The vote on resubmission in the Senate (March 13) was as follows: Yeas, 21 (16 Republicans and 5 Democrats); nays, 15 (13 Republicans, 1 Prohibitionist and 1 Independent). At the April election there was an independent movement of Republicans, known as the "Law Enforcement party," which polled 3,597 votes and left the regulars in a minority, although all but one of their candidates were afterwards elected by the Legislature. The single Republican whose election was prevented was the courageous Attorney-General, Horatio Rogers. Although he was nominated by the Republican, Prohibition and Fourth parties, enough Republicans turned against him, at the dictation of the saloon element, to elect his Democratic opponent. At the next session of the Legislature, in May, the work of resubmission was promptly finished, the final vote standing: in the Senate—yeas, 23 (13 Republicans, 9 Democrats and 1 Independent); nays, 11 (10 Republicans and 1 Prohibitionist); not voting, 4 (3 Republicans and 1 Democrat); in the House—yeas 56 (20 Republicans and 36 Democrats); nays, 13 (10 Republicans, 2 Prohibitionists and 1 Democrat); not voting, 3 (2 Republicans and 1 Democrat). It was arranged that the popular vote should be taken on June 20, 1889, leaving only 20 days for the campaign. Moreover, Pennsylvania was to vote on a Prohibitory Amendment on June 18, and all the leading Prohibition speakers were engaged in that State. The time for the election was deliberately chosen for the purpose of insuring repeal; it was expected that Pennsylvania would give a heavy anti-Prohibition majority on the 18th, which would be demoralizing to the Prohibitionists in Rhode Island on the 20th. In order to remove all doubt of the result, the Legislature passed a special act providing that the new Ballot Reform law, which was to have taken effect on the 1st of June, 1889, should not take effect until the 30th of June; and thus it was arranged that the Prohibition election should occur under the old law, a measure that facilitated bribery and frauds.

In the campaign and at the polls the advantage was wholly with the anti-Prohibitionists. It is true intelligent argument and fair discussion were not used by the repealers; their appeals were addressed to prejudice, and while their whole case rested on the supposed superiority of High License to Prohibition they could offer no evidence in favor of High License. But they had almost exclusive control of the agencies for influencing voters. The two leading political organizations worked for repeal openly. Even the New York *Tribune* made this admission in its Rhode Island correspondence, June 21:

> "The reasons for this great Prohibition repulse are many, outside of the merits of the question. The repealers were abundantly supplied with money. The money was raised by the Liquor-Dealers' Protective Trade Association. They had the use of the ward workers of both the Democratic and Republican parties."

The chief newspapers refused to permit the Prohibitionists to present the reasons against repeal in their columns. An application to the Providence *Journal* for fair treatment drew the following answer:

> "*Dear Sir;* In reply to your note I would say that the terms for the advertising columns of the *Journal* and *Bulletin* can be obtained at this office, with the condition that the matter be of unobjectionable character.
>
> "Yours very truly,
>
> "ALBERT M. WILLIAMS, Editor."

In confidential letters to William E. Johnson of Lincoln, Neb., in 1890, several prominent liquor-sellers of Rhode Island related the secrets of the campaign. Thomas Grimes, a wholesale liquor-dealer of Providence, wrote:

> "The way we handled our campaign here was, we got the Chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee

and the Chairman of the City Committee interested in our behalf, also Gen. C. R. Brayton, the head-pin Republican worker in the State, who is well up in all things pertaining to politics; he took care of the Republican State and City Committees which we paid him $6,000 for his services; in addition it cost us through the newspapers, pamphlets and circulars, $31,000 to do away with Prohibition in this State. I should recommend you to get the newspapers interested in your behalf; it is the strongest point you can use."

Gen. Brayton himself wrote as follows:

"William E. Johnson, *Dear Sir;* I have had experience in opposing Prohibition. I managed the repeal of our State Prohib. Amendment last June. It is too early to commence your campaign as you do not vote until next November.

"For a fair remuneration I will come to Nebraska in September, organize your campaign and start you all right.

"I would like to know before July 1st if I am to come, so that I may bring with me such documents as we used.—Yours truly, Chas. R. Brayton, Box 150.

"Providence, R. I., March 12, 1890.

"I refer you to Hon. Frank Jones of Portsmouth, N. H.; Mr. Weld, Secretary of Mass. Anti-Prohib. Com., Boston, Mass.; Mr. James Hanley, Mr. Thomas Grimes and Molter Bros., of Providence, R. I."

Jesse P. Eddy, a very well-known Providence rumseller, in giving advice to the Nebraska anti-Prohibitionists, based on the experience gained in Rhode Island, wrote:

"Don't have any joint discussions; don't have any speeches unless you can get minister to meet minister. . . . Have four or five good writers, and have their articles published in your papers—if not gratis, pay for them—and send the papers with the articles in to all the voters, far and near. Secure the politicians and wire-pullers to talk against it in every town, dwelling on the expense, increase of taxes, kitchen bar-rooms, attic slums and cellar dives, and the increase of drunkenness caused by Prohibition. . . . Hire politicians to talk privately against this measure. The newspaper is your greatest lever. . . Get correspondents from Kansas, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Maine (in fact from every State where it has been tried) to write up its failure. Have this correspondence published in your newspaper (not all in one paper, but from different States in different papers), paying for the publishing of them if required. . . . Of course in publishing these letters, don't give the name of the writer. Use a *nom de plume*. . . . Hire all the ward and town politicians and workers to work for you."

The vote by counties stood:

Counties.	Repeal of Prohibition. Yes.	Repeal of Prohibition. No.
Bristol	1,083	353
Kent	2,146	1,061
Newport	2,426	744
Providence	21,327	6,090
Washington	1,333	1,708
Totals	28,315	9,956
Majority	18,359	
Majority in excess of three-fifths	5,352	

South Dakota[1] *and North Dakota.*

These two States adopted Prohibitory articles as features of their original Constitutions—not as Amendments. They entered the Union fully committed to Prohibition. As in other States, however, the question of Constitutional Prohibition was decided in them by separate votes of the people. The triumphs in the two Dakotas, won in the fall of 1889, were the first victories for Constitutional Prohibition since Rhode Island was carried in the spring of 1886. Meanwhile nine States successively had voted against the policy.

Although the southern part of Dakota Territory gave a majority for Constitutional Prohibition in 1885, the action taken in that year was without effect, since Congress refused to provide for the erection of a State Government in any part of Dakota. The Territorial Legislature instead of enacting a Prohibitory statute, passed a Local Option and High License law in 1887. Under this measure the majority of the counties voted for local Prohibition, and it was seen that there was a very strong balance of sentiment against license throughout the Territory. On Feb. 22, 1889, Congress passed an Enabling act, providing for the admission of South Dakota, North Dakota, Washington and Montana as States, each of the proposed States being required to frame a Constitution and, on the 1st of October 1889, to hold an election to ratify its Constitution and elect State officers. The South Dakota Prohibitionists had been active since 1885. The Local Option campaigns had aroused much interest. In March, 1888, the Prohibition party was organized, and at the election in November of that year its candidate for Congress polled 1,336 votes (including 418 secured for him in North Dakota) Immediately after the 1888 election the Prohibition party began an active agitation in behalf of Constitutional Prohibition. The work was broadened in the spring of 1889, when a non partisan Convention was held at Huron, and a non-partisan Executive Committee was selected, with V. V. Barnes as Chairman. Soon afterwards the South Dakota Farmers' Alliance, in State Convention, declared emphatically for Constitutional Prohibition. The Methodist Episcopal Conference also adopted very radical resolutions, intimating plainly that the Republicans would be held responsible if the movement should fail in South Dakota. The campaign opened early and extended to all the counties, many well-known speakers from other States being employed. In August the South Dakota Republican Convention met at Huron, and at the dictation of the farmers inserted the following plank in its platform by a nearly unanimous vote:

"Recognizing the pernicious influence of the traffic in intoxicating liquors upon every interest of our Commonwealth, we favor national and State Prohibition of such traffic and the adoption of the article of our Constitution relating thereto, and the enactment and enforcement of such laws as the wisdom of the people may enact."

The Republicans adhered to the spirit of this declaration with reasonable faithfulness. The Democrats pronounced for High License; but even in the Democratic party Prohibition sentiment was so strong that a Prohibitory resolution received more than 50 votes in the State Convention.

The liquor men of South Dakota had a very large fund at their disposal, sent from the East. It was currently reported that in addition to this fund they received $80,000, transferred from North Dakota, where it was thought there was no danger of the adoption of Prohibition. A considerable part of this money was expended in buying the favor or the silence of the press. "High License" was the watchword of the opposition, and many thousands of silk badges with "High License" printed on them were distributed just before the election by the saloon managers.

The South Dakota vote by counties was as follows:

---

[1] The editor is indebted to S. H. Cranmer of Aberdeen, S. D.

	Prohibition.			Prohibition.	
Counties.	Yes.	No.	Counties.	Yes.	No.
Aurora........	690	605	Hyde..........	320	191
Beadle........	1,623	1,179	Jerauld	598	315
Brown........	2,861	1,576	Kingbury	1,305	619
Brookings	1,422	714	Lake	828	783
Brule	118	134	Laurence......	1,223	2,103
Buffalo	773	744	Lincoln........	1,072	842
Bon Homme..	624	1,065	McCook	655	804
Butte	143	154	McPherson....	290	630
Custer....	342	527	Marshall......	857	355
Campbell......	397	268	Mead	445	622
Clark.........	1,214	566	Miner	725	454
Coddington...	978	1,020	Minnehaha....	2,265	2,515
Charles Mix...	575	458	Moody	910	426
Clay...	904	569	Pennington....	701	855
Day...........	1,082	771	Potter	438	418
Douglass......	425	590	Roberts.......	267	129
Duell.........	562	418	Sanborn	828	361
Davison.......	857	621	Spink .. .	1,855	997
Edmons	667	574	Sully	441	279
Fall River....	301	334	Turner........	845	1,106
Faulk	626	459	Union	817	952
Grant.........	834	582	Walworth.....	433	126
Hamlin	749	328	Yankton......	767	1,251
Hand..........	1,147	677			
Hanson..	515	539	Totals......	39,509	33,456
Hughes	545	710	Majority....	6,053	
Hutchinson...	401	1,188			

In North Dakota the victory for Prohibition was a surprise to all. The Prohibitionists had practically admitted that it would be impossible to carry both of the Dakotas, and, believing that conditions were most promising in South Dakota, they had decided to concentrate there. Local efforts were made in North Dakota by a few devoted persons, but no outside help of importance was received. The Republican party treated the question with more caution than was shown in South Dakota. One of the most notable influences contributing to the successful result was the support of Prohibition by the Scandinavian element. In some localities settled almost exclusively by Scandinavians, the vote was nearly unanimous for Prohibition.

The following table shows the North Dakota vote in detail:

	Prohibition.			Prohibition.	
Counties.	Yes.	No.	Counties.	Yes.	No.
Barnes..	861	745	Nelson....... ..	540	276
Burleigh	269	799	Oliver	29	40
Benson	292	212	Pembina	1,483	1,137
Bottineau	365	228	Richland	1,011	885
Billings.... ...	4	53	Pierce.........	124	70
Cass	1,739	2.156	Ransom........	670	557
Cavalier.......	634	439	Ramsey....... .	591	416
Dickey........	966	537	Rolette	112	304
Eddy	212	158	Stark..........	171	394
Emmons......	106	347	Stutsman	509	809
Foster	148	186	Steel..........	444	172
Grand Forks ..	1.531	1.432	Sargent..	620	577
Griggs	345	189	Traill	1,117	824
Kidder....... ..	186	151	Towner..... ..	148	216
Lamoure.....	414	395	Walsh.	1,760	1,132
Logan	26	61	Wells..........	124	190
Morton	358	644	Ward..........	220	138
McHenry	163	101			
McLean.	69	170	Totals.	18,552	17,393
McIntosh......	166	199	Majority.....	1,159	
Mercer........	22	63			

Washington.

This State came into the Union simultaneously with the Dakotas. Considerable interest in the Prohibition question had been displayed for some years. In 1886 a Local Option law was passed, under which many counties were carried against license. The Prohibition party was organized in 1888, polling 1 137 votes for its candidate for Congress. The Washington Temperance Alliance, Woman's Christian Temperance Union and other organizations agitated for the principle of Prohibition. In the Constitutional Prohibition campaign of 1889 the movement was directed by the Temperance Alliance (under the management of Rev. E. B. Sutton). No help of consequence was received from other States. The liquor-dealers made a determined fight. They commanded the co-operation of the Democratic and Republican parties. In King County, the most populous county of Washington, the Chairman of the Republican Committee had ballots prepared from which the words "For Prohibition" and "For Woman Suffrage" were erased, leaving the words, "Against Prohibition" and "Against Woman Suffrage." The farmers did not support Prohibition with the usual alacrity. They betrayed considerable susceptibility to the liquor-sellers' tracts, and the influence of the hop-growers (who form an important factor of the agricultural population of Washington) was seriously felt. The Scandinavians, as in the Dakotas, exhibited a decided preference for Prohibition.

The vote on the Prohibitory article stood:

	Prohibition.			Prohibition.	
Counties.	Yes.	No.	Counties.	Yes.	No.
Adams........	157	210	Okanogan	99	336
Asotin	123	147	Pacific.........	200	355
Chehalis..... ..	517	794	Pierce..........	2,110	4,665
Clalam........	210	173	San Juan......	154	176
Clarke	600	1,105	Skagit	499	846
Columbia......	484	745	Skamania	31	89
Cowlitz........	402	503	Snohomish . .	464	821
Douglas	251	299	Spokane..... .	1,994	2,827
Franklin... ..	38	72	Stevens	184	406
Garfield	392	446	Thurston...... .	624	962
Island.	99	142	Wahhiakum....	65	308
Jefferson......	384	945	Walla Walla...	788	1.534
King....	2,586	3,965	Whatcom	836	1,109
Kitsap	284	526	Whitman	1,822	1,878
Kittitas........	609	1,599	Yakima........	341	589
Klickitat	554	448			
Lewis	802	1,056	Totals........	19,546	31,489
Lincoln........	674	1,082	Majority..........		11,943
Mason.	169	329			

Connecticut.[1]

Connecticut's "Maine law," enacted in 1854, was gradually weakened by amendments, until in 1872 it was repealed by the Republicans. The license and Local Option system that succeeded it was never satisfactory to the temperance people, and their discontent was expressed in various ways, but never very effectively until the Prohibition party movement was revived at the election of 1884 and became a menacing force. In 1882 the Republicans proposed a Prohibitory Amendment for submission to the people, only to repudiate it in 1883. The 2,305 votes for St. John in 1884 and 4,692 for Forbes in 1886 alarmed the politicians, and the submission plan was again brought forward in 1887, when the House decided to submit by 147 yeas to 41 nays (104 Republicans and 43 Democrats voting in the affirmative and 14 Republicans and 27 Democrats in the negative). This action was considered insincere, but when the Legislature of 1889 assembled prominent temperance leaders urged the completion of the work, and petitions signed by 30,000 persons were presented by the Connecticut Temperance Union. Representatives of the liquor traffic appeared before the legislative committee and opposed submission; and on the 17th of April the proposition was defeated in the House. But five days later came the news of the rejection of Constitutional Prohibition in Massachusetts by 45,000 majority; and the Connecticut political managers felt that it would be safe to permit the people to vote on the question, and the Amendment was accordingly submitted.

---

[1] The editor is indebted to Allen B. Lincoln, editor of the *Connecticut Home.*

The Democratic press and leaders showed no sympathy for the measure. but the most influential opposition came from the Republican newspapers and workers. In June there was a conference of representative Republicans at Hartford, and it was decided that the best policy would be to ignore the Amendment during the campaign and to make a general and vigorous attack upon it just before the election. The liquor men made unscrupulous use of all the methods employed by them in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. They took care to cultivate the favor of the High License people. In May Edwin B. Graves, a Democratic editor, started in Hartford an avowed liquor organ called the *Connecticut Herald.* He not only fought the Amendment, but opposed High License. His injudicious course was disapproved of by the liquor leaders, and in August his paper expired from want of support. Much was made of the cider argument; and anti-Prohibition editorials from the *Congregationalist* and *Christian Union,* as well as tracts written and opinions given by various clergymen, were placed in the hands of nearly every voter.

There was no general organization of Prohibitionists effected for conducting the campaign. The Prohibition party, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Connecticut Temperance Union and other forces worked independently of one another, though there was no antagonism. The Connecticut Temperance Union was based on the "non-partisan" idea, and was understood to have Republican tendencies; but its Secretary, Rev. Alpheus Winter, though making earnest appeals to the Republican temperance element, found it impossible to secure efficient co-operation. United States Senator Orville H. Platt, though known as a professed believer in Prohibition and as the author of Prohibitory bills at Washington, declined to take any part in the canvass or to give any encouragement to the cause. United States Senator Joseph R. Hawley, the most prominent Republican of Connecticut, in a letter to his personal organ, the Hartford *Courant,* declared his opposition to the Amendment. All the 27 daily papers of the State were hostile, and not more than half a dozen of the weeklies supported the agitation with any earnestness, so successful had the liquor managers been in their attempts to buy up the press. Able service was rendered, however, by the *Connecticut Home,* the State Prohibition organ.

The vote on the Amendment was as follows:

	PROHIBITION.	
COUNTIES.	Yes.	No.
Fairfield.......	3,810	9,558
Hartford......	4,508	10,673
Litchfield.....	2,232	3,945
Middlesex.....	1,454	2,120
New Haven....	5,301	14,448
New London..	2,391	5,292
Tolland.......	1,020	2,000
Windham......	1,662	1,938
Totals.......	22,379	49,974
Majority............		27,595

[For particulars about the work so far done in behalf of National Constitutional Prohibition, see the article by Senator Henry W. Blair, NATIONAL PROHIBITION.

Consumption of Liquors.—In estimating the annual consumption of liquors in a country an approximation is all that is possible. The total quantity produced, added to the total quantity imported during a given year, less the total quantity exported, will not necessarily represent the exact quantity consumed; for a portion of each year's product and importations will naturally remain as stock in the hands of manufacturers, importers and buyers. But the aggregate year's supply may be assumed to represent the year's demand; and when comparisons for a series of years are to be made, the factor of annual supply may, for the purpose in view, be regarded as coincident with the factor of consumption.

The consumption of intoxicating liquors in the United States, for beverage purposes, has steadily increased since 1840. Not only was the total amount consumed during the year ending June 30, 1888, more than eleven times the amount consumed in 1840, but the average annual consumption of all kinds of liquors for each individual has increased during the same period from 4.17 gallons to 14.30 gallons. The table on the opposite page, from the Quarterly Report of the Chief of the United States Bureau of Statistics for the three months ending March 31, 1889, presents in detail the consumption of intoxicating liquors in the United States since 1840.

These figures show that the quantity of drink consumed per inhabitant has enormously increased during the period covered. The increased consumption of malt liquors is especially noticeable, the average annual per capita consumption having advanced from 1 36 gallon in 1840 to 12.48 gallons during the year ending June 30, 1888. The per capita consumption of wine has nearly doubled since 1840, while the aggregate consumption shows an increase from 4,873,096 gallons in 1840 to 36,335,068 gallons for the year ending June 30, 1888. More than one-third of this increase in the consumption of wine, it will be noted, has been brought about since 1886, and the increase is confined entirely to the consumption of wines of domestic production. The active efforts made by the California wine men to popularize their

STATEMENT SHOWING THE QUANTITIES OF DISTILLED SPIRITS, WINES AND MALT LIQUORS CONSUMED IN THE UNITED STATES, AND THE AVERAGE ANNUAL CONSUMPTION PER CAPITA OF POPULATION DURING THE YEARS 1840, 1850, 1860, AND FROM 1870 TO 1888, INCLUSIVE.

YEAR ENDING JUNE 30.	DISTILLED SPIRITS CONSUMED.				WINES CONSUMED.			MALT LIQUORS CONSUMED.			Total consumption of wines and liquors.	TOTAL CONSUMPTION PER CAPITA OF POPULATION.			
	Spirits of domestic product. From Fruit.	Spirits of domestic product. All other.	Imported spirits entered for consumption.	Total.	Wines of domestic product.*a*	Imported wines entered for consumpt'n.	Total.	Malt liquors of domestic product. *a*	Imported malt liquors entered for consumpt'n.	Total.		Distilled spirits.	Wines.	Malt liquors.	All wines and liquors.
	Pr. Galls.	*Pr. Galls.*	*Pr. Galls.*	*Pr. Galls.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Pr. Galls*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*
1840	(*b*)	40,378,090	2,682,794	43,060,884	124,734	4,748,362	4,873,096	23,162,571	148,272	23,310,843	71,244,817	2.52	0.29	1.36	4.17
1850	(*b*)	46,768,083	5,065,390	51,833,473	221,240	6,094,622	6,315,871	36,361,708	201,301	36,563,009	94,712,353	2.23	0.27	1.58	4.08
1860	(*b*)	83,904,258	6,064,393	89,968,651	1,860,008	9,199,133	11,059,141	100,225,879	1,120,790	101,346,699	202,374,461	2.86	0.35	3.22	6.43
1870	1,223,830	77,266,368	1,405,510	79,895,708	3,059,518	9,165,549	12,225,067	203,743,401	1,012,755	204,756,156	296,876,931	2.07	0.32	5.30	7.69
1871	2,472,011	59,842,617	1,745,033	64,059,661	4,980,783	10,853,280	15,834,063	239,838,137	1,299,990	241,138,127	321,031,851	1.62	0.40	6.09	8.11
1872	1,089,698	65,145,880	2,186,702	68,422,280	6,968,737	9,713,300	16,682,037	268,357,983	1,940,933	270,298,916	355,403,233	1.68	0.41	6.65	8.74
1873	2,965,987	62,945,154	2,125,998	68,037,139	8,953,285	9,893,746	18,847,031	298,519,675	2,177,587	300,697,262	387,581,432	1.63	0.45	7.27	9.29
1874	766,687	61,814,875	1,958,528	64,540,090	10,951,859	9,516,855	20,468,714	297,519,981	2,001,084	299,521,065	384,529,869	1.51	0.48	6.99	8.98
1875	1,757,202	62,668,709	1,694,647	66,120,558	12,954,961	7,036,369	19,991,330	292,961,047	1,992,110	294,953,157	381,065,045	1.50	0.45	6.71	8.66
1876	672,221	57,340,472	1,471,197	59,483,890	14,968,085	5,193,723	20,161,808	306,852,467	1,483,920	308,336,387	387,982,085	1.32	0.45	6.83	8.60
1877	1,527,141	57,016,248	1,376,729	59,920,118	16,942,592	4,933,738	21,876,330	303,854,988	1,072,679	304,926,667	386,723,115	1.29	0.47	6.58	8.34
1878	1,103,351	49,600,838	1,227,752	51,931,941	17,953,386	4,310,563	22,263,949	317,136,597	832,755	317,960,352	392,165,242	1.09	0.47	6.68	8.24
1879	1,021,708	52,003,467	1,253,300	54,278,475	19,845,113	4,532,017	24,377,130	343,724,971	880,514	344,605,485	423,261,090	1.11	0.50	7.05	8.66
1880	1,005,781	61,126,634	1,394,279	63,526,694	23,298,940	5,030,601	28,329,541	413,208,885	1,011,280	414,220,165	506,076,400	1.26	0.56	8.26	10.08
1881	1,701,206	67,426,000	1,479,875	70,607,081	18,931,819	5,231,106	24,162,925	442,947,664	1,164,505	444,112,169	538,882,175	1.37	0.47	8.63	10.47
1882	1,216,850	70,759,548	1,580,578	73,556,976	19,934,856	5,628,071	25,562,927	524,843,379	1,536,601	526,379,980	625,490,883	1.39	0.48	9.97	11.84
1883	1,253,278	75,508,785	1,690,624	78,452,687	17,406,028	8,372,152	25,778,180	549,616,338	1,881,002	551,497,340	655,728,207	1.45	0.48	10.18	12.11
1884	1,137,056	78,479,845	1,511,680	81,128,581	17,402,938	3,105,407	20,508,345	588,005,609	2,010,908	590,016,517	691,653,443	1.46	0.37	10.62	12.45
1885	1,468,775	67,689,250	1,442,067	70,600,092	17,404,698	4,495,759	21,900,457	594,063,095	2,068,771	596,131,866	688,632,415	1.24	0.38	10.44	12.06
1886	1,555,994	69,295,361	1,410,259	72,261,614	17,366,393	4,700,827	22,067,220	640,746,288	2,221,433	642,967,720	737,296,554	1.24	0.38	11.18	12.62
1887	1,211,532	*c*68,385,504	1,467,697	71,064,733	27,706,771	4,618,290	32,325,061	715,446,038	2,302,814	717,748,854	821,138,648	1.18	0.54	11.96	13.68
1888	888,107	*d*73,313,279	1,643,966	75,845,352	31,630,523	4,654,545	36,335,068	765,086,789	2,500,260	767,587,056	879,767,476	1.23	0.59	12.48	14.30

a Product less exports.

b Included with "All other."

c Includes 2,216,645 proof gallons of domestic spirits exported and brought back.

d Includes 2,635,900 proof gallons of domestic spirits exported and brought back.

NOTES.—(1) The production of domestic liquors and wines for 1840, 1850 and 1860 was derived from the United States Census. (2) The consumption of imported liquors and wines for 1840, 1850 and 1860 is the net imports. (3) The production of domestic wines from 1870 to 1887 has been estimated by the Department of Agriculture, by Mr. Charles McK. Loeser, President of Wine and Spirit Traders' Society, New York, and other well-informed persons. (4) The consumption of domestic spirituous and malt liquors from 1870 to 1888 was obtained from the reports of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and for prior years from the United States Census. (5) The consumption of imported liquors and wines from 1870 to 1888 was taken from the official returns made to the Bureau of Statistics by Collectors of Customs. (6) In computing the quantity of sparkling and still wines and vermuth in bottles, five so-called quart bottles are reckoned as equivalent to the gallon.

wares, with the co-operation of the State Government, are no doubt responsible for a very large percentage of the increase.

In the consumption of distilled spirits there has been little change since 1870, though previously to that year there was an apparent average annual per capita consumption of nearly double the present amount. The apparent decline is not due to any marked discrimination by the drinking public against distilled liquor as a beverage, but to the effects of the heavy Internal Revenue tax on alcohol, which by vastly increasing the cost of alcohol has caused many manufacturers and others who formerly used the article extensively in their business, to practically abandon it. For the five years 1858-62 inclusive, just before the Internal Revenue tax became operative, the average price of a gallon of whiskey in the New York market was 24 cents. July 1, 1862, a tax of 20 cents on each gallon of distilled spirits produced was imposed by the Government; and this tax continued in force till March 7, 1864, when the rate was advanced to 60 cents a gallon. July 1, 1864, the tax was raised to $1.50 on every proof gallon of distilled spirits; and again, Jan. 1, 1865, it was advanced to $2 a proof gallon. As a result of this tax the average price of alcohol rose from 54½ cents a gallon in 1862 to $2.464 in 1864 and $4.255 in 1865. One effect of the great increase in the price of alcohol was to reduce at once to a minimum the quantity of distilled spirits used in the mechanic arts.

A United States Revenue Commission, appointed in 1865 to revise the whole Internal Revenue system (David A. Wells, Chairman), made a report in 1866 in which the following interesting explanations were made (p. 161):

"The first and undoubtedly the largest element in such reduction [in the amount of alcohol consumed in the arts, etc.], has been the disuse of alcohol for the preparation of *burning fluid*, which is commonly prepared by mixing one gallon of rectified spirits of turpentine (*camphene*) with from four to five gallons of alcohol. . . . . It would appear by investigations made into this subject by the Commission that the amount of alcohol converted into burning fluid by mixing with rectified spirits of turpentine (*camphene*) and consumed during the year 1860, could not have been less than 12,000,000 gallons, which must have necessitated the use of upwards of 19,000.000 gallons of *proof spirits*. At the South and West, however, large quantities of burning fluid were prepared by mixing the alcohol directly with the *crude* or commercial spirits of turpentine without subjecting the latter constituent to rectification, which amount being allowed for would probably increase the figures above given by one-third, and make the total consumption of alcohol, for the preparation of burning fluid during 1860, 16,000,000 gallons, requiring over 25,000.000 gallons of proof spirits.

"Since 1862 the production and consumption of burning fluid in the United States have almost entirely ceased."

Thus was destroyed in one branch of business alone, independently of beverage consumption, an annual market for over 25,000,000 gallons of proof spirits.

On page 162 of the report the following is said:

"Another important element in the reduction of the production of distilled spirits in the United States in 1864–5, as compared with the production of 1860, has been the extensive disuse of alcohol for a multitude of industrial purposes other than the manufacture of burning fluid. From 1856 to 1862 the price of alcohol in the New York market ranged from 30 to 60 cents per gallon, and this excessive cheapness induced a most extensive use of it in the manufacture of varnishes, hat stiffening, furniture polish, perfumery, tinctures, patent medicines, imitation wines, transparent soaps, percussion caps, picture frames, and in dying, cleaning, lacquering, bathing and for fuel. With the increase of the price since July, 1862, to $4 and upwards per gallon, the use of alcohol for all the above-named purposes has largely diminished or entirely ceased. . . . .

"In some instances entire branches of busiiness have been destroyed in consequence of the great advance in the price of alcohol. An instance in illustration of this may be mentioned in the manufacture of an article known as 'wallosin,' a good substitute for whalebone in umbrellas. . . . . Another business that has been more seriously affected by the increased price of alcohol in consequence of the tax is the manufacture of iron utensils—pots, kettles and pans—enameled upon their interior surfaces. . . . . The manufacture of vinegar from whiskey has also been largely diminished by reason of the great advance in price of the distilled spirits used. . . . Druggists and pharmaceutists have estimated the reduction in the use of alcohol in their general business as one-third to one-half. . . . . Manufacturers of medical tinctures and proprietary medicines almost universally represent to the Commission that the domestic demand for their preparations has fallen off in consequence of the high price of alcohol, to the extent in some instances of more than two-thirds. . . . The business of manufacturing fluid or solid extracts, or the concentrated medical principle of plants, also suffers greatly by reason of the increased cost of alcohol. . . . . In all branches of the industrial arts where the continued use of distilled spirits is indispensable, and no cheaper substitute can be provided, the utmost economy in its employment is everywhere reported."

Of the consumption of distilled spirits at that time for beverage purposes the Commission declared that "through the absence of all positive data any conclusions which may be arrived at must necessarily be regarded as only approximate;" and on page 168 the Commission said: "We are inclined to consider the estimate of a gallon and a half per head for the consumption of the United States as somewhat exaggerated."

In 1869 the average tax per gallon of distilled spirits was reduced from $1.97 to $0.54, and in 1870 it was still further reduced to $0.50. Under these reductions the per capita consumption increased from 1.64 gallon in 1869 to 2.07 gallons in 1870, but in the next year another decrease was witnessed. In 1874 the average tax was again raised to $0.65 per gallon, and since 1876 it has stood at about the present rate of 90 cents a gallon. From the facts above given it is safe to assume that the consumption of distilled spirits for beverage purposes has been diminished very little, if any, in the United States during the period covered by the foregoing table, notwithstanding the enormous increase in the per capita consumption of wine and malt liquors.

The report of Hon. John W. Mason, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, for the year ending June 30, 1889, shows a still further increase over the preceding years in the consumption of malt liquors and distilled spirits. The following table gives in detail the quantities of liquors, malt and distilled, withdrawn for consumption in the United States during the fiscal years 1888 and 1889:

Articles Taxed.	Fiscal Year Ending June 30.		Increase.	Decrease.
	1888.	1889.		
Spirits distilled from apples, peaches and grapes ....gall's	888,107	1,249,593	361,486	....
Spirits distilled from materials other than apples, peaches and grapes. gal's	70,677,379	75,915,047	5,237,668	....
Fermented liquors.... ..bbl's	24,680,204	25,119,853	439,634	....

THE UNITED KINGDOM.

The consumption of liquors in Great Britain and Ireland is shown in the following table, compiled from the "Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom" (1887), and the accounts relating to the trade and navigation of the United Kingdom:

Statement showing the Annual Consumption of Domestic and Foreign Distilled Spirits, Wine, Domestic and Foreign Beer, and the Average Consumption of each per capita of population, in the United Kingdom, during each year for a series of years:

Fiscal Years.	Distilled Spirits Consumed.				Wine Consumed.(a)		Beer Consumed.(b)			
	Domestic.	Foreign.	Total.	Per capita	Total.	Per capita	Domestic.	Foreign.	Total.	Per capita
	Gallons.	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Galls.*	*Gallons.*	*Galls.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Galls.*
1871....	21,563,993	10,728,545	35,292,538	1.12	....	....	....	....	....	....
1872 ...	27,279,519	8,081,303	35,360,822	1.11	....	....	....	....	....	....
1873....	29,322,087	11,872,196	41,194,283	1.28	....	....	....	....	....	....
1874....	30,321,928	10,332,767	40,654,695	1.25	....	....	....	....	....	....
1875....	30,659,043	12,956,833	43,615,876	1.33	....	....	....	....	....	...
1876....	30,534,265	17,794,496	48,328,761	1.46	....	....	....	....	....	....
1877....	30,361,163	10,492,759	40,853,922	1.22	....	....	....	....	....	....
1878 ...	29,884,951	9,316,526	39,201,477	1.15	....	....	....	....	....	....
1879....	28,508,850	10,459,768	38,968,618	1.14	....	....	....	....	....	....
1880....	29,047,303	6,970,499	36,017,802	1.04	....	....	....	....	....	...
1881 ...	29,334,161	5,543,905	34,878,066	1.00	14,925,955	.43	1,184,362,048	572,585	1,184,934,633	33.90
1882 ...	29,251,754	8,382,938	37,634,692	1.07	14,317,329	.41	1,186,877,214	766,712	1,187,643,926	33.65
1883....	29,421,590	7,217,068	36,638,659	1.03	14,154,202	.40	1,178,287,517	918,411	1,179,205,928	33.13
1884....	28,745,893	9,155,931	37,901,874	1.05	13,892,600	.39	1,211,600,222	1,028,738	1,212,628,960	33.72
1885....	27,348,805	9,282,951	36,631,756	1.01	13,425,287	.37	1,190,286,373	983,632	1,191,270,005	32.79
1886....	26,699,159	8,516,793	35,215,952	.96	13,410,577	.37	1,191,730,287	1,044,154	1,192,774,441	32.49
1887....	26,740,121	9,462,070	36,202,191	.98	14,142,885	.38	1,217,731,059	1,149,957	1,218,881,016	32.88

(*a*) The consumption of wine is the net imports.
(*b*) The British beer barrel has been computed at 36 gallons and the ale gallon at 1.22 United States gallons.

The per capita consumption of distilled spirits and wine in the United Kingdom is slightly less than in the United States, the quantities of distilled spirits per capita being respectively in 1887 0.93 and 0.38 gallons in the United Kingdom as against 1.18 and 0.54 gallons in the United States. The per capita consumption of beer in the United Kingdom is, however, almost three times as great as in the United States, being for 1887 in the ratio of 32.88

to 11.96. Owing to the enormous quantity of beer consumed, the total per capita consumption of intoxicating liquors in the United Kingdom is more than double that in the United States, being for the two nations in 1887 33.14 gallons and 13.68 gallons.

FRANCE.

In France the consumption of wine is almost equal to the consumption of beer in the United Kingdom, while the quantity of distilled liquors consumed for each individual does not differ materially from that drank in the United States.

Statement showing the ANNUAL PRODUCTION, IMPORTATION, EXPORTATION, and CONSUMPTION of DISTILLED SPIRITS, and the AVERAGE CONSUMPTION per capita of population, in FRANCE, during each year from 1870 to 1885, inclusive:

[From "Annuaire Statistique de la France," 1888.]

YEARS.	PRODUCTION.	IMPORTATION.	TOTAL Production and Importation.	EXPORTATION.	CONSUMPTION.	
					Total.	Per capita.
	Gallons.	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*
1870	32,677,829	1,685,959	34,363,788	12,818,929	21,544,859	.58
1871	42,293,617	2,276,670	44,570,287	11,529,647	33,040,640	.91
1872	49,954,547	1,267,488	51,222,035	16,275,778	34,946,257	.97
1873	37,617,808	1,269,469	38,887,277	14,773,285	24,113,992	.67
1874	40,470,844	1,626,865	42,097,709	10,918,912	31,178,797	.86
1875	48,845,033	1,702,127	50,547,160	12,573,620	37,973,540	1.52
1876	45,146,653	1,731,766	46,878,419	13,923,291	32,955,128	.89
1877	34,579,853	2,559,147	37,139,000	7,938,573	29,200,427	.79
1878	37,432,889	3,563,151	40,996,040	8,633,947	32,362,093	.88
1879	39,308,496	5,287,310	44,595,806	9,656,206	34,939,600	.95
1880	41,765,277	6,921,360	48,686,637	8,112,529	40,574,108	1.10
1881	48,131,774	6,311,523	54,443,297	8,320,615	46,122,682	1.22
1882	46,678,839	7,568,497	54,247,336	7,091,142	47,156,194	1.25
1883	53,124,587	4,427,542	57,552,129	7,843,049	49,709,080	1.32
1884	51,116,895	5,073,966	56,190,861	7,775,104	48,415,757	1.28
1885	49,241,288	5,178,445	54,419,733	7,752,676	46,667,057	1.24

NOTE.—The hectoliter has been computed at 26.417 United States gallons.

Statement showing the ANNUAL PRODUCTION, IMPORTATION, EXPORTATION, and CONSUMPTION of WINE, and the AVERAGE CONSUMPTION per capita of population, in FRANCE, during each year from 1870 to 1886, inclusive.

[From "Annuaire Statistique de la France," 1888.]

YEAR.	PRODUCTION.	IMPORTATION.	TOTAL Production and Importation.	EXPORTATION.	CONSUMPTION.	
					Total.	Per capita.
	Gallons.	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*
1870	1,440,651,095	3,344,656	1,443,995,751	75,711,254	1,368,284,497	37.90
1871	1,559,281,389	3,903,402	1,563,184,791	87,684,786	1,475,500,005	40.87
1872	1,450,826,421	13,695,629	1,464,522,050	90,609,517	1,373,912,533	38.03
1873	951,012,000	17,271,461	968,283,161	105,177,463	863,105,998	23.91
1874	1,847,532,756	17,980,335	1,865,513,091	85,392,530	1,780,120,561	49.31
1875	2,065,864,559	7,709,247	2,073,573,806	98,558,445	1,975,015,361	54.75
1876	1,170,436,145	17,868,459	1,188,304,604	87,992,676	1,100,311,928	29.81
1877	1,460,151,939	18,686,435	1,478,838,374	81,935,971	1,396,902,403	35.14
1878	1,337,676,384	42,343,307	1,380,020,091	73,835,172	1,306,184,919	35.39
1879	700,658,302	77,616,078	778,274,380	80,485,651	697,788,729	18.97
1880	895,950,492	190,745,903	1,086,696,395	65,714,427	1,020,981,968	27.66
1881	1,019,106,810	207,076,444	1,226,183,254	67,949,702	1,158,233,552	30.75
1882	1,025,648,611	199,098,034	1,224,746,645	69,166,997	1,155,579,648	30.67
1883	1,219,540,964	237,245,609	1,456,786,573	67,130,141	1,389,656,432	36.88
1884	940,323,603	214,766,881	1,155,090,484	65,296,616	1,089,793,868	28.93
1885	831,636,853	216,187,878	1,047,824,731	68,757,533	979,067,198	26.25
1886	802,713,144	290,874,813	1,093,587,957	71,570,265	1,022,017,692	26.74

NOTE.—The hectoliter has been computed at 26.417 United States gallons. Population of France in 1872, 36,102,921; 1876, 36,905,788; 1881, 37,672,048; 1886, 38,218,903.

It will be noticed from these tables that the annual per capita consumption of distilled spirits in France seems to be on the increase, while the per capita consumption of wines is decreasing. The "Exportation" column is particularly interesting. Despite the destructive work of the phylloxera, France exports nearly as much wine now as she did in 1870. The United States imports annually more than $6,000,000 worth of French wines and brandies. Little attempt is made to deny that practically all the wines and spirits intended for export are adulterated. A Paris dispatch to the American newspapers, dated Aug. 28, 1890, said:

"The French papers are very much exercised over the McKinley bill as well as the Customs Administrative bill [high tariff measures then pending in the United States Congress.—Ed.]. *La France*, commenting on the rumor that the measure is one of retaliation, and that the United States seriously contemplates the prohibition of all adulterated French wines, says that as there is scarcely a single bottle of wine produced in France which is not manipulated with plaster of Paris or other extraneous substances, such a measure will exclude all French wines from the market of the States, and warns the French that they had better come to terms with America, since it offers reciprocity."

GERMANY.

In Germany beer, again, is the great national drink.

Statement showing the Annual Production, Importation, Exportation, and Consumption of Distilled Spirits, and the Average Consumption per capita of population, in Germany, during each year from 1870 to 1887, inclusive:

[From "Statistisches Jahrbuch für das Deutsche Reich."]

FISCAL YEARS, AFTER 1876 ENDING MARCH 31—	PRODUCTION.	IMPORTATION.	TOTAL PRODUCTION and Importation.	EXPORTATION.	CONSUMPTION.	
					Total.	Per capita.
	Proof Gallons.	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons*	*Gallons.*
1870	45,939,163	766,093	46,705,256	16,220,038	30,485,218	1.00
1871	43,059,710	924,595	43,981,305	12,653,743	31,320,562	1.03
1872	45,163,657	818,927	46,282,584	7,079,756	39,202,828	1.27
1873	50,165,883	951,012	51,116,895	13,868,925	30,247,970	1.16
1874	54,973,777	1,188,765	56,162,542	15,763,257	42,399,285	1.27
1875	57,351,307	1,320,850	58,672,157	10,566,800	48,105,357	1.43
1876	53,864,263	1,347,267	55,211,530	10,434,715	44,776,815	1.32
1877-'78	52,966,085	1,135,931	54,102,016	14,714,269	39,387,747	1.14
1878-'79	55,079,445	1,135,931	56,215,376	14,529,350	41,686,026	1.19
1879-'80	53,837,846	1,268,016	55,105,862	16,008,702	39,097,160	1.11
1880-'81	57,747,562	977,429	58,724,991	18,042,811	40,682,180	1.14
1881-'82	65,532,995	1,503,121	67,035,916	30,518,652	36,517,264	1.02
1882-'83	59,312,109	1,615,597	60,927,706	21,642,683	39,285,023	1.09
1883-'84	60,683,484	2,525,723	63,209,207	25,002,327	38,206,880	1.05
1884-'85	62,952,609	2,104,769	65,057,378	29,858,770	35,198,608	.96
1885-'86	66,397,624	1,561,023	67,958,647	25,486,840	42,471,807	1.15
1886-'87	57,662,262	2,437,539	60,099,801	19,379,851	40,719,950	1.09

Note.—The hectoliter has been computed at 26.417 United States gallons; the ton of 1,000 kilograms has been computed at 2,204.6 pounds, and 6 pounds and 10 ounces of spirits at 1 gallon.

Statement showing the Annual Production, Importation, Exportation, and Consumption of Beer, and the Average Consumption per capita of population, in Germany, during each year from 1872 to 1887, inclusive:

[From "Statistisches Jahrbuch für das Deutsche Reich," 1888.]

FISCAL YEARS AFTER 1876 ENDING MARCH 31—	PRODUCTION.	IMPORTATION.	TOTAL Production and Importation.	EXPORTATION.	CONSUMPTION.	
					Total.	Per capita.
	Gallons.	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*
1872	886,158,265	1,400,101	887,558,366	7,819,432	879,738,934	21.50
1873	995,498,228	1,875,607	997,373,835	7,660,930	989,712,905	23.93
1874	1,027,304,296	2,614,283	1,029,919,579	8,506,274	1,021,413,305	24.46
1875	1,046,245,285	3,143,623	1,049,388,908	10,249,796	1,039,139,112	24.65
1876	1,043,682,836	3,487,044	1,047,169,880	15,136,941	1,032,032,939	24.22
1877-'78	1,028,176,057	3,037,955	1,031,214,012	17,435,220	1,013,778,792	23.46
1878-'79	1,025,270,187	2,720,951	1,027,991,138	17,857,892	1,010,133,246	23.11
1879-'80	983,848,331	2,298,279	986,146,610	17,963,560	968,183,050	21.90
1880-'81	1,018,956,524	2,483,198	1,021,439,722	22,586,535	998,853,187	22.35
1881-'82	1,033,142,453	2,536,032	1,035,678,485	25,994,328	1,009,684,157	22.45
1882-'83	1,038,822,108	2,641,700	1,041,463,808	26,284,915	1,015,178,893	22.45
1883-'84	1,079,742,041	2,853,036	1,082,595,077	28,530,360	1,054,064,717	23.19
1884-'85	1,119,393,958	2,773,785	1,122,167,743	30,485,218	1,091,682,525	23.78
1885-'86	1,105,736,369	2,932,287	1,108,668,656	32,994,833	1,075,673,823	23.25
1886-'87	1,190,561,356	3,566,295	1,194,127,651	28,292,607	1,165,835,044	24.99

Note.—The hectoliter has been computed at 26.417 United States gallons.

Thus the per capita consumption of distilled spirits is about the same in Germany as in France and Great Britain, and is slightly less than in the United States. The per capita consumption of beer, which seems to be slightly on the increase, is about twice as large as in the United States, and one-fourth less than in the United Kingdom.

DENMARK AND SWEDEN.

In Denmark and Sweden the average per capita consumption of distilled spirits is very much larger than in any nation heretofore considered, being for each country, respectively, in 1886, 4.23 and

2.47 gallons, although there seems to be a slightly decreasing tendency in Denmark.

Statement showing the ANNUAL PRODUCTION, IMPORTATION, EXPORTATION, and CONSUMPTION of DISTILLED SPIRITS, and the AVERAGE CONSUMPTION per capita of population, in DENMARK and SWEDEN, during each year for a series of years:

DENMARK.—[From "Sammendrag af Statistike Oplysninger angaaende Kongeriget Danmark," No. 10, 1889.]

YEARS.	PRODUCTION.	IMPORTATION.	TOT. Prod. and Imp.	EXPORTATION.	CONSUMPTION.	
					Total.	P. cap.
	Gallons.	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*
1882	9,416,322	385,385	9,801,707	447,484	9,354,223	4.72
1883	9,201,878	780,448	9,982,326	823,494	9,158,832	4 62
1884	8,947,745	871,246	9,818,991	784,574	9,034,417	4.56
1885	8,458,512	550,605	9,009,117	517,676	8,491,441	4.28
1886	8,332,455	510,706	8,843,161	465,665	8,377,496	4.23

NOTE.—One pot has been computed at .2552 gallon. In the absence of later data the per capita consumption has been computed on the basis of the census of 1880.

SWEDEN.—[From the "Statistisk Tidskrift utgifven af Kungl. Statistika Centralbyran," Stockholm.]

YEARS.	PRODUCTION.	IMPORTATION.	TOT. Prod. and Imp.	EXPORTATION.	CONSUMPTION.	
					Total.	P. cap.
	Gallons.	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*
1881	12,541,654	739,826	13,281,480	1,767,671	11,513,809	2.53
1882	9,820,224	660,242	10,480,466	315,116	10,165,350	2.22
1883	8,622,310	645,398	9,267,708	102,693	9,165,015	1.99
1884	8,931,191	639,861	9,571,052	63,299	9,507,753	2.05
1885	10,467,089	3,279,168	13,746,257	2,402,665	11,343,592	2.42
1886	10,611,412	7,821,440	18,432,852	6,786,127	11,646,725	2.47

NOTE.—The hectoliter has been computed at 26.417 gallons.

Detailed statistics for the other countries of Europe are not at hand. Mulhall (edition of 1886) gives the following totals:

	MILLIONS OF GALLONS.				ALCOHOL.
	Wine.	Beer.	Spirits.	Equiv. in Alco.	Galls. per Inhabit'nt.
Austria	300	245	30	53.0	1.45
Belgium	4	170	10	11.4	2.07
Holland	3	35	12	8.2	2.05
Italy	480	20	10	50.2	1.76
Portugal	60	1	1	7.0	1.55
Russia	30	63	145	80.6	1.05
Spain	220	2	3	24.0	1.48

Of all the civilized nations from which we have detailed official reports as to the consumption of liquors, the Dominion of Canada must be credited as the most temperate. The total average per capita consumption of all intoxicating liquors in Canada for the year ending June 30, 1888, was but 4.61 gallons, 3.76 gallons being malt liquors.

Statement showing the ANNUAL CONSUMPTION of DOMESTIC and FOREIGN DISTILLED SPIRITS, WINE and MALT LIQUORS, and the AVERAGE CONSUMPTION per capita of population, in the DOMINION OF CANADA, during each year from 1881 to 1888, inclusive:

[From the "Trade and Navigation" and the "Returns and Statistics of the Inland Revenue" of the Dominion of Canada.]

YEARS ENDING JUNE 30—	DISTILLED SPIRITS CONSUMED.				WINE CONSUMED.*a*		MALT LIQUORS CONSUMED.			
	Domestic.	Foreign.	Total.	Per capita.	Total.	Per capita.	Domestic.*b*	Foreign.	Total.	Per capita
	Gallons.	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Galls.*	*Gallons.*	*Galls.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Galls.*
1881	3,214,543	701,825	3,916,368	.91	461,328	.11	9,874,374	214,887	10,089,261	2.33
1882	3,552,818	892,298	4,445,116	1.03	560,296	.13	12,018,338	248,391	12,276,729	2.84
1883	3,848,787	1,004,083	4,852,870	1.12	621,965	.14	12,714,998	346,697	13,061,695	3.02
1884	3,608,021	960,933	5,568,954	1.06	542,547	.12	13,079,395	410,434	13,489,829	3.12
1885	4,274,722	964,181	5,238,903	1.21	515,159	.12	12,066,649	343,379	12,410,028	2.87
1886	2,478,098	906,019	3,384,117	.78	494,518	.11	13,277,487	346,153	13,623,640	3.15
1887	2,864,935	748,428	3,613,363	.84	459,218	.10	14,783,630	335,268	15,118,898	3.50
1888	2,326,327	875,118	3,201,445	.74	475,790	.11	15,942,956	315,366	16,258,322	3.76

NOTE.—In the absence of later data the per capita consumption is based on the census of 1881.

(*a*) Imported wine entered for home consumption. (*b*) Production minus exports.

The following comparative table is from the quarterly report of the United States Bureau of Statistics for the three months ending March 31, 1889:

Comparative summary of the CONSUMPTION PER CAPITA of POPULATION in the UNITED STATES, the UNITED KINGDOM, FRANCE, GERMANY, DENMARK, SWEDEN and the DOMINION OF CANADA of DISTILLED SPIRITS; and in the UNITED STATES, the UNITED KINGDOM, FRANCE and GERMANY of WINES and MALT LIQUORS, during each year from 1881 to 1887, inclusive:

[From original official data.]

COUNTRIES.	1881.	1882.	1883.	1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.
DISTILLED SPIRITS.	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*	*Gallons.*
United States	1.37	1.39	1.45	1.46	1.24	1.24	1.18
United Kingdom	1.00	1.07	1.03	1.05	1.01	.96	.98
France	1.22	1.25	1.32	1.28	1.24	(*a*)	(*a*)
Germany	1.14	1.02	1.09	1.05	.96	1.15	1.09
Denmark	(*a*)	4.72	4.62	4.56	4.28	4.23	(*a*)
Sweden	2.53	2.22	1.99	2.05	2.42	2.47	(*a*)
Canada	.91	1.03	1.12	1.06	1.21	.78	.84
WINES.							
United States	.47	.48	.48	.37	.38	.38	.54
United Kingdom	.43	.41	.40	.39	.37	.37	.38
France	30.75	30.67	36.88	28.93	26.25	26.74	(*a*)
Germany	(*a*)	(*a*)	(*a*)	(*a*)	(*a*)	(*a*)	(*a*)
Canada	.11	.13	.14	.12	.12	.11	.10
MALT LIQUORS.							
United States	8.63	9.97	10.18	10.62	10.44	11.18	11.96
United Kingdom	33.90	33.65	33.13	33.72	32.79	32.19	32.88
France	(*a*)	(*a*)	(*a*)	(*a*)	(*a*)	(*a*)	(*a*)
Germany	22.35	22.45	22.45	23.19	23.78	23.25	21.99
Canada	2.33	2.84	3.02	3.12	2.87	3.15	3.50

(*a*) No data.

NOTE.—The years referred to are those specified in the preceding tables.

C. DEF. HOXIE.

Corea.—This country, so long called, and most justly, "the Hermit nation," and opened to the world by American diplomacy under Commodore R. H. Shufeldt, U. S. N., in 1882, is situated between China and Japan. It has an area of 82,000 square miles, and a population of about 12,000,000. The official name of the kingdom is Chō-sen, or Land of Morning Calm. The people are less conservative and stolid than the Chinese, and less enterprising and mercurial than the Japanese, and exhibit a happy medium in physique and temperament between the two. Owing to the general prevalence of the meat-eating habit on account of the abundant animal food, and because also of the remarkable absence of tea in a country midway between the greatest tea-producing countries of the globe, the use of alcoholic drinks is general. The pages of Corean history from ancient times are stained with the records of drunkenness and dissipation. A characteristic incident is related of Yasuhiro, an envoy of Japan to Séoul, the Corean capital, in A. D. 1592, when the veteran noted that the Corean dignitaries were prematurely old from dissipation instead of from campaigns and toils. The vocabulary of the language is surprisingly rich in terms relating to the various kinds of intoxicating drinks, cups, measures and degrees of drunkenness. The native liquor, by preference, is a strong spirit made from rice, though the whiskey imported over the border from Manchuria is much in vogue. Rice, millet and barley are employed, and both fermented and distilled liquors are prepared from these grains. These drinks vary in color, taste, strength and smell. They range from beer to brandy in intoxicating power. In general they are sufficiently smoky, oily and alcoholic, and little attempt is made except for the costly grades to extract the fusel oil gendered in the process of distillation. The Government levies a malt tax on the industry, but makes no attempt to regulate the traffic, except "for revenue only." In case of a failure of crops, as in 1876 and 1889, or even during severe shortage, the manufacture and sale of the native beverage are forbidden in certain sections under severe penalties. It is said that in the city of Ai-chiu or Wiju on the northwestern border, there are 1,500 families supported by the traffic in intoxicants. All travelers, their own vocabulary, history and folk-lore agree in charging to the Coreans habits of gluttony and dissipation which are fostered by the general use of liquor. Corea is one of the poorest countries in the world, though by right and nature it might become one of the richest; and much of its extreme poverty may be fairly laid to the national passion for alcoholic drink. "Drunkenness is in great honor in this country," writes Dallet, with whom Ross agrees. "If a man drinks of rice-wine so as to lose his senses, no one considers it a crime. A mandarin, a great dignitary, a minister even, can, without loss of reputation, roll under the table at the end of his dinner. Or he may sleep himself sober, and his assistants, instead of being scandalized at this disgusting spectacle, congratulate him on being rich enough to be able to procure so great a pleasure." Unfortunately, to the native production of intoxicants is now added the new danger from the liquor-sellers of Christendom. In the annual trade reports and returns for 1888, issued by the Custom House at Séoul, we find that malt liquors, wines and spirits were imported in 1887 to the amount of $14,014, and in 1888, $16,098. One gleam of hope however is in the active prosecution of Christian missionary labors, and the establishment of churches, already two in number. The dissemination of Christian temperance principles along with the planting of tea and the cultivation of taste for non-alcoholic drinks will improve the sad state of things in this country so cursed with official corruption, disease and needless poverty.

[See "Corea, the Hermit Nation," and "Corea Without and Within," besides the writings of Ross, Dallet, Carles, Lowell, and the letters of missionaries.]

William Elliott Griffis.

Cornell, John Black.—Born in Far Rockaway, Long Island, Jan. 7, 1821, and died in New York City, Oct. 26, 1887. He was descended from prominent ancestors. One ancestor was a member of the Colonial Legislature of New York (except for two years) from 1739 to 1764; another, the grandfather of John B., was a member of the New York General Assembly for seven years at the close of the last century. The founder of Cornell University, Ezra Cornell, and his son, Gov. Alonzo B. Cornell, are descended from another branch of the same family, as is also ex-President Woolsey of Yale College. When 17 years of age John B. Cornell came to New York City and was apprenticed to his brother George, who was then senior member of an iron firm. In 1847 John and his younger brother William set up in the iron business for themselves, and the new firm soon acquired the high standing it has since held. Mr. Cornell was active in enterprises of the Methodist Episcopal Church. In the year 1872, and again in 1876, he was sent as a lay delegate to the General Conference, and he was a prominent member of important church boards, such as the Board of Managers of the Missionary Society, the General Committee on Missions and the Book Committee. He also held the more important positions of President of the New York City Church Extension and Missionary Society, and President of the Board of Trustees of Drew Seminary. He was an ardent Abolitionist at a time when his views on slavery cost him much of his popularity among his friends, and in later years he was a staunch party Prohibitionist, a most generous contributor to the cause.

Cost of the Drink Traffic.—The expenditures of the people of the United States for the support of the drink traffic fall naturally under two heads: (1) *Direct* expenditures, or the sums paid by consumers for intoxicating liquors, and (2) *Indirect* expenditures, or those paid by the people on account of the crime, pauperism, drunkenness, disorder, idleness, sickness, poverty, taxes, etc., due to the traffic.

1. DIRECT COST.

The report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the year ending June 30, 1889, shows that the quantities of domestic liquors withdrawn for consumption during that year were:

Distilled spirits	77,164,640 proof gallons.
Fermented liquors	25,119,853 barrels.

In computing the cost to the consumer of the domestic distilled spirits used for beverage purposes it is necessary, first, to consider that the 77,164,640 proof gallons withdrawn for consumption in 1889 included a certain unknown quantity of alcohol used in the arts, manufactures, etc. Although this quantity is unknown, it may safely be estimated at not more than 10 per cent. of the total distilled product (see Alcohol), or 7,716,464 gallons. Deducting this sum there remains 69,448,176 proof gallons of spirits drank by the people in 1889. But the alcoholic strength of a proof gallon in the warehouse (50 per cent.) is largely reduced by the time the article reaches the barroom, by adulteration and by dilution with water. The average retail strength is not in excess of 40 per cent.; and therefore the aggregate volume of beverage spirits is increased fully one-fifth—that is, the 69,448,176 proof gallons of beverage spirits withdrawn for consumption in 1889 became 83,337,811 gallons when ready for sale over the bar. The average retail price of a gallon of spirits to the consumer is, at a low estimate, $6.[1] Therefore the retail cost of distilled spirits consumed for beverage purposes in the United States in 1889 is found to have been $500,026,866 on the basis of a conservative reckoning.

During the same period the people drank 25,119,853 barrels of domestic beer, as shown by the Internal Revenue returns. A barrel of beer contains 31 gallons[2] or 496 half-pints, a half-pint being, approximately, the capacity of an ordinary beer-glass. Each glass (or half-pint) retails for five cents; and the average retail price per barrel, accepting the figures just given, is consequently $24.80. But it must be borne in mind that a considerable portion of the beer used, especially among the working classes, is sold by the bucket or "growler," and carried away to be consumed at home or in the shop; and when so sold the price is much lower than by the glass. On the other hand each glass or bucket of beer contains a large percentage of froth. Taking all the elements into consideration it seems reasonable to think that $18 per barrel is a very low estimate of the average cost of beer to the public; and if this estimate is accepted the total retail cost of domestic beer in 1889 was $452,157,354.

Besides distilled spirits and beer the United States now consumes annually about 30,000,000 gallons of domestic wine. (See CONSUMPTION OF LIQUORS.) The average value of this product to the consumer may safely be reckoned at $2 per gallon, making a total cost of $60,000,000 for domestic wines.

During the year ending June 30, 1889, according to the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, the imports of liquors and their stated values were as follows:

	QUANTITIES.	STATED VALUES.
Malt liquors	2,524,681 gals.	$1,361,990
Brandy	400,089 "	1,076,265
Other distilled spirits	1,127,458 "	851,822
Champagne and other sparkling wines	315,870 doz.	4,254,413
Still wines	3,078,554 gals. 260,026 doz.	3,452,359
Total		$10,996,849

But the values here stated were the values of the liquors before they had left the Custom House. Allowing for the import duties charged upon them, subsequent increase of volume by means of dilution and adulteration, profits made by importers, wholesalers and retailers, etc., it is entirely fair to estimate that at least 100 per cent. must be added to the stated value before the cost of these imported liquors to the public at large can be approximately indicated. That is, the aggregate retail cost of imported liquors in 1889 may be put at $21,993,698.

Collecting the various items, we have the following summary of the *direct* cost of the drink traffic to the people of the United States for the year ending June 30, 1889:

Domestic distilled spirits, 83,337,811 gallons, at $6	$500,026,866
Domestic beer, 25,119,853 barrels, at $18	452,157,354
Domestic wines, 30.000,000 gallons, at $2	60,000,000
Imported liquors of all kinds, $10,996,849, to which add 100 per cent	21,993,698
Total	$1,034,177,918

In this estimate no account is taken of the illicit whiskey of the "moonshine" stills, cider, home-made wines or smuggled liquors. It must also be considered that the calculations made above are conservative, inclining to understatement rather than to overstatement. Probably a juster estimate of the total direct cost would be $1,100,000,000. Even this figure is smaller than the one obtained by applying to the official returns for 1889 the methods of calculation used by Hargreaves. On the other hand, certain statisticians have made lower estimates. F. N. Barrett, editor of the *American Grocer*, at the request of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics in 1887, submitted a report on the subject, which was printed in a special report issued by the Bureau. Mr. Barrett, in a letter accompanying his analysis, indicated his anti-Prohibition sentiments by an uncomplimentary allusion to "fanatical advocates." According to his figures, the annual direct expenditure for drink in the United States, on the basis of Government statistics for the year ending June 30, 1886, was $700,000,000.[1] He estimated the average price of whiskey at 7½ cents per drink, or $4.50 per gallon, instead of 10 cents and $6, the figures that we have adopted; and he reckoned the price of domestic beer to the consumer at 50 cents per gallon, or $15.50 per barrel, instead of $18 per barrel, the price that we give. Mr. Edward Atkinson, at about the same time, made an independent calculation, agreeing with Mr. Barrett's conclusion that the direct expenditures for drink at that time aggregated about $700,000,000 per annum. This estimate of $700,000,000 is the lowest one that has been made in recent years.

---

[1] In order to obtain an expert estimate, the editor submitted the question to Robert A. Greacen, a prominent wholesale liquor-dealer of New York, who said: "A gallon of whiskey will make about 80 ordinary-sized drinks, but it is safe to reckon 75 in order that there may be no dispute. Bartenders often reckon 60, to allow for their own treats." A drink of whiskey is seldom sold for less than 10 cents, except in the very lowest dives, where sometimes it may be obtained for seven or even five cents. On the other hand, saloons of the more pretentious class charge 15 cents per drink, or two drinks for a quarter. It is obvious, therefore, that our estimate of $6 per gallon to the consumer is considerably below the actual average.

[2] Internal Revenue Laws of the United States, Chapter 5, Section 3,339.

The total direct cost of the drink traffic is steadily increasing. For the year ending June 30, 1889, the quantity of distilled spirits withdrawn for consumption showed an increase of 5,599,154 gallons over the quantity withdrawn the previous year—that is, allowing 10 per cent. for spirits used in the arts, etc., and adding one-fifth to the remainder on account of dilution and adulterations, there was an increase of 6,047,086 gallons, indicating an increased cost during the year to the public of $36,282,416 for domestic distilled spirits alone; at the same time the domestic beer consumed showed an increase of 439,634 barrels, indicating an increased cost of $7,913,412 on account of domestic beer. Thus in 1889 the direct cost of drink to the public (omitting wines and imported liquors of all kinds) was $44,195,828 greater than in 1888. Comparisons with other years show results more or less striking. It is manifest, therefore, that the direct cost of the traffic is increasing at the rate of from $40,000,000 to $50,000,000 per year.

In speaking of the direct cost we have not here made allowance for the sums paid by liquor-makers and sellers for grain, hops and grapes, buildings, machinery and appliances, labor, etc. It is, of course, understood that the money paid by the people for drink is not all retained by the drink-dealers, but is in part paid by them in turn to persons engaged in various pursuits. But the magnitude of the profits of the liquor traffic is not under consideration in this article. Even if the aggregate sums paid back by the liquor traffic to the people, or special classes of the people, were large enough to balance precisely the sums paid by the people for liquors, the traffic would not on that account be a contributor to the general welfare. Upon this subject Mr. E. J. Wheeler comments in a logical manner in his book, "Prohibition: The Principle, the Policy and the Party." "Suppose," says he, "that $700,000,000 is the sum paid each year for drink in this country. Not a dollar of this sum, it may be, will be lost to the nation; but the labor and the material used in making and marketing the liquor for which this sum was expended are lost to the nation. The value of that material and labor is represented by the $700,000,000 after the taxes and license fees are deducted. Suppose, by way of illustration, that this nation withdraws from other forms of industry 500,000 men, and sends them to labor for one year in the construction of the Nicaragua canal. Let $700,000,000 be the sum paid them for their labor, their transportation, the cost of machinery, and all their appliances. And suppose, further, that in one way or another every dollar of this sum is by the end of the year returned again to the nation, either in exchange for provisions purchased, or in bank deposits, or in some other form. The nation would not have lost a single dollar of the $700,000,000, but it would have lost *the equivalent of that sum*, in the necessaries, comforts and luxuries supplied to these men. If the work they have in the meantime performed has created a canal whose value is $700,000,000, the nation has lost nothing but interest. If the work has proved valueless, the loss has been $700,000,000 plus the interest. If the work has proved to be positively destructive, the amount of value destroyed must be added to the $700,000,000 to ascertain the full extent of the loss." By similar processes of calculation the accounts for and against the liquor-traffic must be made up.

---

[1] Mr. Barrett's estimates, if made for the year ending June 30, 1889, would show a total direct expenditure for that year of not less than $800,000,000.

2. INDIRECT COST.

It is still more difficult to give exact figures of the indirect cost. The items to be taken into account are so numerous and the statistics are often so unsatisfactory that any conclusion which may be suggested must be the result of interpretation rather than of direct calculation. In relation to a few of the most important items it is possible to deal with approximate figures.

1. *Pauperism.*—Mr. Fred. H. Wines, in the Compendium of the 10th Census (1880) says: "It is almost if not quite impossible to obtain the statistics of pauperism." He reports 67,000 inmates of almshouses in 1880. The average cost of their support would be about $100 a year, making a total of $6,700,000. In the State of New York the official report for 1888 gives the cost of out-door relief as about two-thirds of the cost of maintaining paupers in almshouses. Estimating at this rate for the whole country, we should have $4,466,666 for out-door relief, making $11,166,666 expended in the nation on account of pauperism in 1880. On the very reasonable assumption that three-fourths of this was due to intemperance, we should have a total of $8,374,889 given from public funds for maintaining paupers created by the drink business. There can be no doubt that this estimate is much under the mark. It does not include any part of the sums paid to pensioners of various kinds. Besides, the expenditures of charitable organizations, under the direction of churches, societies and private individuals, are left out of the account.

2. *Crime.*—Similar difficulties are encountered in estimating the cost of crime. Mr. Wines, in his pamphlet, "Crime, the Convict and the Prison," says: "The problem involves many estimates, some of which are very obscure." Taking the number of inmates of prisons and reformatories as given in the Census of 1880, 70,000, and reckoning the expenditure (including prisons and repairs) at $200 a year per inmate, he estimates the total cost of crime in the United States in 1880 at $15,000,000. To this should be added the cost of arrest and trial, making, according to Mr. Wines, "$50,000,000 annually raised by taxation to defend the community against the ravages of crime." Judge Noah Davis and many other experienced and impartial observers declare that three-fourths of all crime is due to intemperance; and conservative processes of calculation therefore indicate a total expenditure of $37,500,000 per annum for crime due to drink,—assuming that Mr. Wines has approximated the actual amount in reckoning the entire outlay at $50,000,000. But there is good reason for believing that he has not done so. On pages 546–7 we print figures and deductions indicating that in cities of the United States having an aggregate population of about 17,000,000, the expenses of the police department alone, on account of offenses due to drink, are in excess of $26,000,000 annually.

3. *Insanity, etc.*—The Census returns show that 168,982 insane and idiotic persons were enumerated in the United States in 1880. The enumeration was far from complete. At $200 each per year (the cost of many exceeding this) the cost of the insane and idiotic to the public would exceed $33,000,000 annually. In view of the great perplexities of the problem we shall charge only one-fourth to the saloon, making $8,250,000. Besides the insane and idiotic there are other "defectives," the deaf, dumb and blind, cripples and the like, and multitudes who stand on the "border lines." Considering the universally recognized fact that the hereditary influence of drink is one of the most prolific causes in the production of defective persons, the money used in caring for these victims of liquor must reach an appalling total.

4. *Sickness.*—Dr. Hargreaves, by what seems a reasonable computation,[1] estimates that there are 150,000 persons simultaneously sick in the United States in consequence of intemperance. It is probable that an equal number of temperate persons are made sick through the intemperance of others, especially women and children, who suffer terribly from want of fuel, clothing, food and all the comforts of life because of the drunkenness of husbands and fathers, not to speak of the sufferers from absolute violence and abuse. If this be conceded, and the average cost of medical attendance and medicine be placed at the low figure of $1 a day, the total annual cost will be $109,500,000.

---

[1] Worse than Wasted, p. 54.

QUALIFYING FACTORS.

In computing the indirect cost it is requisite, however, to allow for any items to the credit of the traffic. The most important item is that of revenue paid by it to Federal, State and local authorities. For the year ending June 30, 1889, the taxes from distilled and fermented liquors collected by the Internal Revenue Department of the Federal Government aggregated $98,036,041.59. In the same year the total expenditures of the Internal Revenue Department amounted to $4,185,728.65, of which perhaps one-fourth was paid for collecting the taxes on tobacco, oleomargarine, etc., leaving upwards of $3,000,000 expended in 1889 for collecting the Federal revenues from liquors. Hence the aggregate annual income of the National Government from the drink traffic on account of Internal Revenue is not in excess of $95,000,000, to which add customs duties from liquors aggregating $7,786,399.87—making a grand total of about $102,800,000.

In the same year the total number of dealers in liquors paying Internal Revenue taxes was 181,783. It is not a fair assumption that all of these dealers were regularly licensed by State and local authorities; and it must be remembered that a great many were druggists, selling liquors for medicinal and similar purposes under merely nominal license fees. It will probably be right to take it for granted that not more than 170,000 of the 181,783 persons who paid Internal Revenue taxes were regularly and exclusively engaged in the liquor business under State and local license laws in 1889. About one-third of these dealers were in the distinctively low license States of New York, California, Wisconsin and Maryland, States in which the annual license rate, striking an average, is certainly not in excess of $150. The distinctively High License States, like Massachusetts, Nebraska, Minnesota, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Illinois and Missouri, contained less than one-third. From these figures it seems proper to conclude that the average annual license fee per liquor-dealer paid into State and local treasuries is not more than $250. Estimating that there are now in the United States 170,000 persons subject to ordinary license charges, the total revenue of State and local Governments from the traffic is $42,500,000. From this a certain sum must be deducted for the cost of collecting—say 5 per cent., or $2,125,000; leaving a balance of $40,375,000, which added to the Federal revenue gives an aggregate of about $135,000,000 revenue per annum paid by the drink traffic in the whole of the United States to Federal, State and local authorities.

In considering whether other items to the credit of the traffic may justly be allowed for, it is very difficult to adopt a basis of reasoning that will be acceptable to all persons. It is claimed by pro-liquour statisticians that the sums paid for labor are to be counted absolutely to the credit of the traffic. On the other hand it is maintained that if the traffic were utterly destroyed the laborers now engaged in it would find other employment, while many thousands whose working power is now ruined or impaired by drink would find their wage-earning power improved. The same antagonistic claims are set up by different persons in considering the significance of the expenditures made by the traffic for machinery, buildings, material, etc. In the opinion of the opponents of the traffic, these expenditures count for less than nothing when viewed from the standpoint of wise national economy. It is, therefore, impossible to make allowance for them in this article.

The estimated revenue ($135,000,000 per annum) seems, therefore, to stand as the sole item to the credit of the traffic in reckoning its cost to the people of the United States. Against this revenue is an expenditure, direct and indirect, of probably about $2,000,000,000, annually increasing at from $40,000,000 to $50,000,000. And in estimating the indirect cost we have taken no account whatever of losses from fires due to intemperance, depreciation of property values, losses due to the stimulation of allied evils like gambling and prostitution, losses resulting from the enforced illiteracy and ignorance of multitudes whose ability to strive for better things is destroyed by the saloon, etc, etc. It is manifestly within the bounds of moderation to believe that the money equivalent of these unestimated losses approximates if it does not exceed the entire boasted revenue.

Craig, William H.—Born in Galt, Canada, Aug. 18, 1849, and died at his home in Kansas City, Mo., April 9, 1890.

He came to the United States in 1864, and although but 15 years of age attached himself to the commissary department of the United States Army and served until the end of the Civil War. He purposed studying for the ministry, but his eyes failing him during his course at the Northwestern University at Evanston, Ill., he was obliged to give up the plan, and began his business career as clerk in a Chicago house. He was married, September, 1877, to Jennie E. Northup of Joliet, Ill., and in 1878 they removed to Kansas City, where Mr. Craig entered the real estate business and amassed a fortune. He was a prominent member of the Methodist Episcopal Church. A total abstainer from boyhood, he always advocated the principle of the Prohibition of the liquor traffic. Upon joining the Prohibition party he became a recognized leader of it in the West. Soon afterwards he began the publication of the Kansas City *Herald*, a weekly journal devoted to the interests of the new party and temperance reform. This paper never paid expenses, but Mr. Craig continued to issue it until 1889, when he disposed of it to local Prohibitionists who afterwards permitted it to expire. Mr. Craig made large donations to the Prohibition work: one year the Woman's Christain Temperance Union of Missouri received from him a check for $1,000. As the candidate of the Prohibition party for State Treasurer of Missouri in 1888 he received 4,524 votes.

Crime.—The study of mental pathology has clearly established the fact that the faculties and propensities of the human mind can be stimulated or depressed by purely physical agencies. There are drugs that excite the activity of the imagination, and injuries to certain parts of the cerebral organism tend to weaken the memory; just as other drugs stimulate the functions of the digestive organs, while the laceration of certain nerves or sinews may result in lameness or the loss of sight. The influence of alcohol thus affects the higher faculties of the human brain. It torpifies the moral instincts and weakens the faculty of logical inference, while at the same time it stimulates the propensity of combativeness. Animals fuddled with alcoholic drugs become ill-tempered and aggressive—often to the degree of attacking their own keepers. By a half-ounce dose of strong rye-brandy Dr. Hermann Gessner of Munich excited a usually gentle deerhound to a pitch of fury which came near endangering the life of the experimenter. "The greater part of the exciting influence of alcohol," says Prof. Otto of Upsala, is directed toward the posterior and inferior portions of the brain; in other words, it excites chiefly the organs of the animal propensities, and according to the law that whatever stimulates strongly one class of cerebral organs weakens another class, alcohol, while it adds vigor to the animal propensities, enfeebles the intellectual faculties and the moral sentiments."

The history of crime has invariably confirmed that conclusion. "The places of judicature I have long held in this Kingdom," says Sir Matthew Hale, Chief-Justice of England, "have given me an opportunity to observe the original cause of most of the enormities that have been committed for the space of nearly 20 years; and by due observation I have found that if the murders and manslaughters, the burglaries and robberies, the riots and tumults, the adulteries, fornications, rapes and other outrages that have happened in that time were divided into five parts, four of them have been the issues and products of excessive drinking."

Just 200 years later an independent observer of our own country arrived at almost exactly the same conclusion. Dr. Elisha Harris of New York, in a monograph on the subjective causes of crime, published in 1873, says: "As a physician familiar with the morbid consequences of alcoholic indulgence in thousands of sufferers from it, as a student of physiology interested in the remarkable phenomena of inebriation, and as a close observer of social and moral tendencies, it was easy for the writer to believe that not less than one-half of all crime and pauperism in this State depends upon alcoholic inebriety. But after two years of careful inquiry into the history and condition of the criminal population, he finds that his conclusion is inevitable that, taken in all its relations, alcoholic drinks may justly be charged with far more than half of the crimes that are brought to conviction in the State of New York, and that fully 85 per cent. of all convicts give evidence of having in some larger degree been prepared or enticed to do criminal acts because of the physical and distracting effects produced upon the human organism by alcohol."

Prison officials of every civilized country have confirmed that verdict. "By far the most fruitful single cause of crime is the temptation of the public tavern," says prison chaplain Eberts of Brunswick, Germany, "and though poverty or revenge may in many cases prove to have been the proximate cause of lawless acts, intemperance and the consequent habits of shiftlessness would in nine out of ten cases be found to have developed the original bias of the moral disposition that lured trespassers from the path of rectitude." "I have heard more than 15,000 prisoners declare that the enticements of the ale and beer-houses had been their ruin," says the Rev. Mr. Clay, Chaplain of the Preston (England) House of Correction, "and if every prisoner's habits and history were fully inquired into it would be placed beyond a doubt that nine-tenths of the English crime requiring to be dealt with by the law arises from an English sin which the same law scarcely discourages." "The alleged vindictiveness of the Latin races," says Prison Inspector Longinotti of Naples, "is rarely noticed in rural districts where the poverty of the peasants or other causes have made temperance an involuntary virtue. In the cities brawls and vendettas are children of the same fiend that has proved a fruitful parent of idleness and unchastity. Intemperance, aided perhaps by the social temptations of city life, is the chief cause of crime." "On examining the reports of the Prison Inspectors for the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario," says a report to the Dominion House of Commons, "your Committee further find that out of 28,289 commitments to the jails for the three previous years, 21,236 were committed either for drunkenness or for crimes perpetrated under the influence of strong drink."

In summing up the prevalent causes of crime we shall find that intemperance must, in every case, be regarded either as a direct or indirect factor of the conditions favoring the development of a vicious disposition.

1. Drunkenness excites the instinct of destructiveness and thus becomes a direct cause of violence, and often of wholly unprovoked assaults.

2. Inebriety clouds the perceptive faculties and thus disqualifies its victims for judging the consequences of their acts or realizing the force of dissuasive arguments.

3. Habitual intemperance weakens the influence of self-respect and eventually almost deadens the sense of shame.

4. Intemperance tempts to idleness—the parent of vice.

5. Intemperance is a chief cause of poverty, and thus indirectly of the crimes prompted by hunger and distress.

6. Alcohol tends to beget a disinclination to intellectual employments, and thus neutralizes a chief agency of reform.

7. Intemperance begets a hereditary disposition to idleness and vice. The lineage of the notorious Jukes family has been traced to a man who is described as a hunter, sometimes a vagrant and always a hard drinker, and seven-eighths of whose descendants were either paupers or habitual criminals. In the thirtieth annual report of the Executive Committee of the Prison Association of New York we find the detailed premises of an estimate that the total loss to society by the crime and the shiftlessness of that family amounted in 75 years to nearly a million dollars. With rare exceptions the female descendants of that generation of dram-drinkers were almshouse pensioners or harlots. The males, with still rarer exceptions, were thieves, vagrants or paupers.

It has often been urged by the apologists of the drink habit that a good deal of the mischief charged to the influence of alcohol is an unavoidable consequence of ignorance and poverty; but aside from the fact that drunkenness is a chief cause of illiteracy and pauperism, it is a suggestive circumstance, confirmed by the testimony of many competent observers, that "want and distress, uncombined with dissolute habits, are rarely productive of crime." Thus in temperate Hindustan, a famine threatening the very existence of eleven million human beings resulted in nothing more criminal than an increase of vagrancy. The fearful distress of the Silesian weavers in 1856-8 led to an increase in the frequency of petty thefts (pilfering of field produce by starving children), but to not a single act of violence, riot or armed robbery. Whole families, on the point of death by actual starvation, remained in their houses, quietly awaiting the action of the relief committee, and, restrained by life-long habits of frugality and self-denial, declined to resort to acts of lawless vengeance even when the insolvency of their employers was clearly proved to have been a fiction of fraud. The history of our Labor reforms abounds with similar instances of self-denial under extreme provocations to lawlessness, wherever the counsels of moderation were seconded by habits of sobriety; while, on the other hand, even the rigor of military discipline has not always been able to prevent a pandemonium of crime when alcohol added its fuel to the fire of violent passion. The Austrian General Tilley explained the monstrous outrages committed during the sack of Magdeburg by the frank admission that he had lost the reins of discipline. "They got wine enough to make four-fifths of them drunk," he said, "and all the protests of my officers were unavailing against the rage of an uncontrollable plurality." Similar scenes followed the defeat of the Russian army in the defiles of Zorndorf. "The vanquished infantry," says Carlyle ("History of Frederick the Great," vol. 5, p. 368), "broke open the sutler's brandy casks, and in a few minutes got roaring drunk. Their officers, desperate, split the brandy-casks. Soldiers get down to drink it from the puddles, furiously remonstrate with the officers, and kill a good many of them—a frightful blood-bath and brandy-bath and chief nucleus of chaos then extant above ground."

FELIX L. OSWALD.

[For particulars of the prevalence of crime under different systems of liquor legislation, see HIGH LICENSE, PROHIBITION, BENEFITS OF, and the Index.]

Crusade.—The Woman's Crusade was certainly one of the most striking movements of the latter half of the 19th Century. It was without precedent in the history of crusades in that it was conducted by women alone. It was without precedent in its high and noble purpose, and in its immediate and far-reaching results. First inaugurated in Ohio during December, 1873, it was preceded by some marked and unusual events in that State. In the winter of 1872, at Springfield, O., two saloon-keepers were tried under the Adair law, which in 1870 had been so amended that the wife or mother of the drunkard could bring suit for damages in her own name against the liquor-seller. In both these suits Mrs. E. D. Stewart ("Mother Stewart"), who became a foremost leader in the Crusade, appeared as advocate for the drunkard's wife. The trial was by jury in the Justice's Court, and Attorney G. C. Rawlins for the prosecution insisted on Mother Stewart's pleading the cause of those much-wronged women. She made an able plea and won both suits. During the same year she went on Sunday, disguised in a long gossamer and sun-bonnet, to a saloon near her church and bought a glass of liquor which she took home with her. This evidence of violated law caused the closing of the saloon. She tried to persuade the Springfield women to open a crusade against the saloons, but they were too timid.

Dr. Dio Lewis spoke in Fredonia, N. Y., Dec. 14, 1873. He told the story of his mother and her friends praying for the liquor-dealer who was destroying their homes. He incited the women to form a society for the purpose of visitation to the saloons. Mrs. Judge Barker was chosen President and leader. An appeal to the liquor-dealers was drawn up, and saloons were visited by 100 women, but the work was soon abandoned and the saloons were not closed. A similar effort was made in Jamestown, N. Y., Dec. 17, 1873. A band of 62 women visited saloons, but their closing was not effected. It was but a few days after these efforts in Fredonia and Jamestown that the whole country was thrilled by reports of the uprising of women in Hillsboro and Washington C. H., Ohio.

On the 23d of December, 1873, Dio Lewis spoke in Hillsboro. He declared that the dram-shops could be closed if only the women had energy, persistence and a true Christian spirit. A motion to put the new idea into execution was carried by a rising vote. In a very short time the names of 75 ladies of standing and influence were enrolled. A committee of three was appointed to write an appeal. The Chairman of this committee was the wife of Judge Thompson and daughter of an ex-Governor of the State of Ohio, Mrs. Eliza J. Thompson, who became the leader and mother of the Crusade. She was not present at the lecture, but her young son was, and he went home full of the strange doings that were to be inaugurated. He told of the meeting appointed for the next morning in the Presbyterian Church, and urged his mother to go. The young daughter also brought her Bible opened at the 146th Psalm, saying, "I believe it is for you." Mrs. Thompson read, and new meanings flashed through her soul. She no longer hesitated, but went at once to the church, where a goodly audience was already assembled. She was unanimously chosen leader, and opening the Bible she read the 146th Psalm, which has ever since been called the "Crusade Psalm." By request Mrs. Gen. McDowell led in prayer, and although she had never before heard her own voice in public, she spoke with "tongue of fire" and the audience melted in tears. Mrs. Cowden, wife of the Methodist minister, started the hymn,

"Give to the wind thy fears,
Hope, and be undismayed;
God hears thy sighs and counts thy tears:
He will lift up thy head."

While thus singing, Mrs. Thompson said: "Let us form in line, two by two, the small women in front, the tall ones in the rear, and let us proceed on our sacred mission, trusting alone in the God of Jacob." Seventy-five women fell into line, while more than that number remained to pray in the church. The band called at three drug-stores whose proprietors signed a pledge binding themselves to sell liquor only on physicians' prescriptions. One druggist, Dr. Dunn, refused to sign the pledge offered, and finally brought suit against the ladies for "trespassing and obstructing his business." They visited hotels and saloons until the "number of drinking-places was reduced from 13 to one drug-store, one tavern and two saloons that sold most cautiously." Morning prayer-meetings were held every day (save Sunday) during the winter and spring, and a wonderful influence seemed to permeate the whole community.

From Hillsboro, Dio Lewis went to Washington C. H., Dec. 24, 1873, where he again told the story of his mother's efforts, and again called on the women to adopt this plan for the rescue of their homes. A "praying band" was formed. Fifty-two women enrolled their names as Committee of Visitation. A "Committee of Responsibility," composed of 37 men, was also appointed. Three ladies were chosen to draw up an appeal to liquor-sellers. Mrs. George Carpenter was Chairman of the Committee and leader of the "band." The appeal prepared by these ladies was generally used in Ohio and other States. It was as follows:

"Knowing, as you do, the fearful effects of intoxicating drinks, we, the women of Washington C. H., after earnest prayer and deliberation, have decided to appeal to you to desist from this ruinous traffic that our husbands and brothers, and especially our sons, be no longer exposed to this terrible temptation, and that we may no longer see them led into those paths which go down to sin and bring both soul and body to destruction. We appeal to the better instincts of your hearts, in the name of desolate homes, blasted hopes, ruined lives, widowed hearts, for the honor of our community, for our happiness, for the good name of our town, in the name of God who will judge you and us, for the sake of your own souls which are to be saved or lost. We beg, we implore you to cleanse yourselves from this heinous sin, and place yourselves in the ranks of those who are striving to elevate and ennoble themselves and their fellow men. And to this we ask you to pledge yourselves."

From the morning meeting of Dec. 26, 40 of the very first women of Washington C. H. marched from the church and began their work of visitation and prayer. Meanwhile other ladies, with many gentlemen, remained in prayer at the church; and while the women went from saloon to saloon—not omitting hotels and drug-stores,—every few minutes the tolling of the church-bell told all who could hear that concerted action and prayer were moving upon the saloon. All that day doors were open and uniform courtesy was shown. The next day doors were locked and the band knelt in the snow on the pavement. But in spite of locked doors, the day was marked by the first surrender ever made by a saloon-keeper of all his liquors in answer to prayer. He gave his entire stock into the women's hands to do with it as they chose. Hundreds of people crowded the street, while shouts, cries, laughter, praises and ringing of church-bells formed the accompaniment to the gurgling stream of "fire-water" as it flowed away and hid in the earth. On the 2d of January, 1874, in a great mass-meeting, announcement was made that "the last liquor-dealer had unconditionally surrendered." The result of eight days of prayer and song was the closing of 11 saloons and the pledging of three druggists to sell only on physicians' prescriptions. The next week a liquor house in Cincinnati pledged $5,000 to break down the movement. A new man took out a license, and a stock of liquors was forwarded to one of the deserted saloons. The Crusaders followed the liquors and remained in the saloon, engaged in prayer until 11 o'clock at night. They returned the next day and remained without fire or chairs a part of the time locked in, while the would-be dealer went away. The next day a temporary tabernacle was built in front of the saloon, and the women continued in prayer. Before night the man surrendered, and the saloon was closed.

The history of this movement in Washington C. H. and Hillsboro is essentially its history in hundreds of towns in Ohio and other States. Like a prairie fire it swept through all the Northern States to the Mississippi River, and west into Nebraska and Kansas, and also into some of the Southern States—notably Kentucky, West Virginia and Missouri. In a few places in Ohio some roughness was shown by policemen; but generally much courtesy was the rule. In Cincinnati and Pittsburgh, Pa., the women were arrested and taken to jail, but no trial took place. Very false impressions were given by the newspapers. In parts of this country and in Europe the Crusade was thought to resemble the Reign of Terror in Paris, and the Crusaders were likened to the French women who filled the streets of that fated capital. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The women who led and who participated in the Crusade were persons of the highest social standing. They were the first women of the churches, wives and daughters of Governors, Judges, clergymen and leading business men. They were women of ability, of unimpeached Christian character, and of the highest culture. Never in one single instance were they guilty of any act of violence. Never did they touch any liquor-dealer's property until under the influence of song and prayer, which seemed to bring heaven down upon him, showing him the heinousness of his destructive business, he surrendered and gave them permission to do what they would with his stock of liquors. One German saloon-keeper called the Crusaders "Dem Rock in Ages Women." The power of that remarkable uprising of women has not been spent, neither will it be until the mission for which it was sent is accomplished.

CLARA C. HOFFMAN.

Cumberland Presbyterian Church.—The General Assembly, at Kansas City, Mo., May 16, 1889, adopted the minority report of the Committee on Temperance, declaring in part as follows:

"1. That nothing short of Constitutional and statutory Prohibition of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors as beverages by the United States and the several States will be satisfactory, and to this end we will pray and work.

"2 That admitting that it is a crime, 'it cannot be legalized without sin.' It cannot be licensed without legalizing it; therefore to vote for license is sin.

"3. That the manufacture of and dealing in, or in any way favoring such dealing (this includes revenue officers, such as gaugers, storekeepers, etc.), is inconsistent with the Christian character, and should receive church discipline.

"4. That we, as a church, stand squarely and unequivocally in favor of Prohibition. and hereby pledge ourselves to aid in every laudable enterprise that in any way looks to the overthrow of the accursed liquor traffic, now licensed and protected by the general Government and most of the States. . . .

"This report is to be considered as advocating the principles of Prohibition, and not as an indorsement of any political party."

Cushing, Henry Dearborn.—Born in Salisbury, N. H., Oct. 15, 1803, and died in Washington, D. C., in October, 1881. When he was a boy his parents removed to Orange, N. H. The school advantages there were poor, but he did much general reading from books borrowed of a neighbor who lived six miles from his home. At the age of 15 he was thrown upon his own resources on account of the poverty of his family. From that time until he was 18 he worked upon a farm, taught school, and studied a term or two at an academy. He began the study of Latin at his home, walking six miles twice a week, after a full day's work, to recite to his teacher. At 18 he found employment in Boston, and afterwards engaged in business with a brother at Bangor, Me., only to return to Boston in 1842, having suffered reverses. In the last ten years of his life he devoted much of his energies to the temperance cause. He was an active member of the Massachusetts Temperance Alliance, and took a prominent part in its discussions, sometimes speaking from the platform but oftener presenting carefully-prepared papers. In 1878 he issued an able tract on "City Governments," and 10,000 copies were circulated by the Alliance. For two years before his death he was an invalid. Always a most generous contributor of money to temperance work, in his will he bequeathed 5 per cent. of a valuable estate to be used by the President of the Massachusetts Temperance Alliance in furtherance of Prohibition. He also addressed the following words in his will to his heirs: "I should have given more to the temperance cause but for a belief that it can be best sustained by living men and women. So I commend that cause to my heirs, and hope they will sustain it by their example, money, influence and votes."

Daniel, William, fourth candidate of the Prohibition party for Vice-President of the United States; born on Deal's Island, Md., Jan. 24, 1826. His father was a native of North Carolina, and his mother of Maryland. He was educated in the public schools and at Dickinson College, graduating in 1848. He studied law and was admitted to practice in 1851. In 1853 he was elected a member of the Maryland House of Delegates and introduced a Prohibitory liquor bill similar to the Maine law. He was re-elected to the House in 1855 on the temperance issue, and in 1857 was returned to the State Senate as an advocate of Local Option. After serving one term he removed to Baltimore, where he has since resided, pursuing his profession. In 1864 he was a member of the Maryland State Constitutional Convention. He was a champion of freedom, and took a prominent part in the discussions of that body which resulted in the emancipation of Maryland's slaves. At first a Whig in politics and afterwards a Republican, Mr. Daniel was an earnest advocate of the Prohibition of the liquor traffic almost from the beginning of his career. He was chosen President of the Maryland State Temperance Alliance, organized in 1872, and retained that position until 1884. Through the influence of this Alliance and especially the efforts of its President, a Local Option law was enacted in Maryland, under which Prohibition was carried in several counties. Mr. Daniel attended the National Prohibition Convention of 1884 at Pittsburgh, as the head of the Maryland delegation, and was made Temporary Chairman of the body. He was nominated for Vice-President and received 150,626 votes. From 1885 until 1888 he was Chairman of the Maryland State Prohibition Committee. He has been identified with the interests of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and has been active in Sunday-school work, in the Young Men's Christian Association, and in efforts for the elevation of the negro. He was for many years a member of the Board of Trustees for Dickinson College.

Deaths from Drink.—See LONGEVITY.

Delano, William H.—Born in Herkimer County, N. Y., in 1816, and died in Bedford, O., in 1885. He never attended school, but educated himself by reading, and was so far advanced at the age of 16 that he successfully taught a district school. His father and several brothers were addicted to the use of alcoholic liquors, but William, early in life, pledged himself to total abstinence and to warfare against the traffic. At the age of 17 he determined to enter the ministry, and, not able to acquire a college training, he began preaching in 1835, and from that time until his death in 1885 was a clergyman in the Baptist Church. He was an Abolitionist, and while preaching in central New York he was a "conductor" on the "underground railroad" and helped many a slave to reach Canada. He sometimes stood guard with a shot-gun to protect the slaves he had secreted in his house. He took part in the famous "Jerry Rescue" at Syracuse, N. Y. He was not less enthusiastic in the temperance cause, and was connected with the Sons of Temperance, the Good Templars and the Washingtonian movement. In 1880 he went over to the Prohibition party, and although well advanced in years labored zealously for its success until his death. While pastor at Garretsville, O., in 1878 and 1879, his opposition to the saloon was so obnoxious to the liquor interests that his church building was blown up with gunpowder.

Delavan, Edward Cornelius.—Born in Schenectady County, N. Y., in 1793, and died in Schenectady, N. Y., Jan. 15, 1871. He acquired a fortune as a wine-merchant. In 1828, in company with Dr. Eliphalet Nott, he organized, in Schenectady, the New York State Temperance Society. In 1831 he defrayed the expenses of Rev. N. Hewitt's temperance mission to Europe. In 1834 he persuaded Dr. Justin to draw up a temperance declaration, to which he secured the signatures of Presidents Jackson, Madison, John Quincy Adams, Van Buren, Tyler, Polk, Taylor, Fillmore, Pierce, Buchanan, Lincoln and Johnson. The declaration was as follows:

> "Being satisfied from observation and experience, as well as from medical testimony, that ardent spirit, as a drink, is not only needless but hurtful and that the entire disuse of it would tend to promote the health, the virtue and the happiness of the community, we hereby express our conviction that should the citizens of the United States, and especially the young men, discontinue entirely the use of it, they would not only promote their own personal benefit but the good of our country and of the world."

As early as 1835, as Chairman of the New York State Temperance Society, and by reason of his personal activity, he was recognized as the most prominent leader of the temperance cause in New York. The *American Temperance Intelligencer* and the *Temperance Recorder*, published at Albany, were virtually under his control, and their wide circulation made them more influential than all the 15 other temperance journals then published combined. The *Recorder*, the monthly organ of the New York State Temperance Society, started March 6, 1832, had at that time a circulation of over 200,000 copies. He engaged in a discussion of the Bible wine question in 1835, and his arguments attracted general attention. He accused the Albany brewers of using foul water in their business, and eight suits at law for damages aggregating $300,000 were brought against him. One case came to trial five years later, and upon his acquittal the others were dismissed. He was prominent also in the agitation against the use of fermented liquors. When the American Temperance Union was organized in 1836 he became Chairman of its Executive Committee and donated $10,000 to its treasury. In 1838 he visited Europe, taking with him to England a large supply of temperance literature, including 800 volumes of Dr. Edwards's "Permanent Temperance Documents." In France, on Nov. 12 of this year, Mr. Delavan had an interview with King Louis Philippe, who agreed to sign a declaration expressing his opinion that the habitual use of intoxicating liquors was injurious, if Mr. Delavan thought it would benefit France.

Delaware.—See Index.

Delirium Tremens.—Delirium tremens, or *mania a potu*, is a nervous disorder caused by the habitual use of alcoholic stimulants, and in regard to its pathological tendency may be defined as nature's ultimate protest against the continuance of the alcohol vice. The first remonstrance comes in the form of nausea, languor and sick headache—symptoms familiar in the experience of every incipient toper. Loss of appetite and general disinclination to active exercise are the penalties of intemperance in its more advanced stages of development, and those injunctions remaining unheeded, nature's ultimatum is expressed in the incomparable distress of nervous delirium. Insomnia, or chronic sleeplessness, is superadded to a chronic loss of appetite; headaches and dizziness alternate with fits of frantic restlessness; the pulse becomes feeble and rapid, the breath feverish, and twitchings of the motor muscles keep the hands and tongue in a trembling motion; the patient raves or talks incessantly and is terrified by ghastly visions. Continued sleeplessness aggravates these symptoms to an appalling degree and at last results in utter exhaustion of the nervous system. From that state of far-gone debility, the drug-doctors, incredible as it may seem, often attempted to rouse the patient by the use of alcoholic stimulants. That mistake, suggested by the delusion that alcohol is a source of nerve-force, made delirium tremens, in hospital practice, an almost invariably fatal disease; and that experience has at last enforced a progressive reform in the treatment of the disorder. "I have come to the conclusion," says Dr. James Edmunds, "that the use of spirits in the case of delirium tremens does nothing but injure the patient, and probably hastens his death. I now, without the slightest hesitation, in every case should immediately stop the spirit, and I find that very few cases of delirium tremens, if treated on that plan, will prove fatal." "If you follow the old treatment," says Prof. Palmer of the University of Michigan, "you will lose half your patients. If you follow the treatment I give, you will save nearly all. In the hospital of Edinburgh the expectant treatment is found to save nearly all the patients. They used to lose nearly all."

Abstinence from alcohol in the treatment of delirium tremens is certainly favored by the circumstance that the patient loses his appetite for all virulent stimulants whatever, and temporarily, indeed, loathes the very odor of alcoholic liquors. The patient should be kept as quiet as possible without a resort to violent means of restraint. The progress of cerebral congestion can generally be kept under control by applying ice to the head; and if the irritation of the digestive organs causes the stomach to reject food administered in the usual manner, the vital strength of the organism may be sustained by means of nutritive injections. Experience has proved that it is not advisable to repress the attempts at muscular exertion altogether (as by the use of straight-jackets), but merely to guard the patient against serious injury, and allow him by the restlessness of his movements to bring on a sufficient degree of exhaustion to induce sleep. A short slumber obtained in that way, rather than by the use of narcotics, has nearly always a restorative effect; and by the law of periodicity, aided by such artifices as the temporary darkening of the bedroom windows, drowsiness leading to more or less protracted sleep can be made to recur at certain hours of the day. After the partial subsidence of the more violent symptoms, the patient may be permitted to enjoy the occasional benefit of out-door exercise; but his diet should for at least a month be limited to semi-fluid, non-stimulating articles of food, such as rice-gruel with a little butter and sugar, pea-soup, milk porridge and soft-boiled eggs. Cooling applications to the head should be continued, and the utmost care should be taken to guard the convalescent against the temptations of his besetting vice, as half an ounce of brandy is often sufficient to bring on a violent and frequently incurable relapse of delirium. FELIX L. OSWALD.

Democratic Party.[1]—As a national organization the Democratic party has become the avowed and persevering opponent of Prohibitory legislation in the United States. Viewed broadly, it is recognized as the special champion and protector of the liquor interests. By a critical examination of its tendencies and actions, the impartial observer discovers that this general verdict admits of local exceptions and certain qualifications; but no discriminating estimate of the party's attitude and performances can be justly expressed in milder words.

EARLY PERFORMANCES.

The so-called rum power, as an organized and aggressive factor in national politics, is a creation of the revenue legislation of the Civil War. The Prohibitory and restrictive laws enacted in many States before the war period were obtained with comparative ease, because the traffic was not then the disciplined and watchful foe that it has since become. In the absence of formidable organized resistance, the earnest demands for Prohibition by multitudes of the best citizens prompted political leaders of all parties to make concessions to agitators so reputable and so determined. The Democrats, in these years, manifested a generous inclination to incorporate the Prohibitory principle (at least nominally) in the statutes of the country. The first Maine law (1846) and the revived and strengthened Maine law of 1851 were passed by Democratic Legislatures. Other rude Prohibitory laws (those of Illinois, 1851; Minnesota, 1852; Michigan, 1853; Ohio, 1854; Iowa, 1855; Indiana, 1855; Nebraska, 1855; Mississippi, 1855, and Texas, 1855), are to be credited to the Democrats. But even in that formative period the Democratic party, in representative and critical struggles for Prohibition, gave indication of the vigorous pro-saloon policy that was subsequently to distinguish it. Among the most important Prohibition contests made before the war was that in the State of New York in 1854, resulting in the election of Myron H. Clark as Governor on a platform favoring Prohibition. In that campaign Horatio Seymour was the Democratic candidate, and he and his party were firmly opposed to Prohibition. The Democrats were responsible for the repeal of the Maine law in 1856, and for the practical destruction of the Adair law of Ohio in 1859.

---

[1] The editor is indebted to John A. Brooks, D.D., Kansas City, Mo.

When the Prohibitory agitation was renewed after the issues of the war had been settled, the Democratic party espoused the cause of the opposition. Lacking power in most of the Northern States, it yet played an influential part in nurturing and directing the organized antagonism. Under the leadership of Tilden in New York, in the early 'seventies, it made a successful fight against Local Option and won so strong a support from the saloon element that the Republicans, in alarm, repudiated their pledges in order to divide with it the liquor vote. In Pennsylvania it became the undisguised representative of the liquor-dealers in their effort to repeal the Local Option law under which more than 40 counties of that State had voted for Prohibition in 1873. In Ohio it led the saloon forces in their assaults upon the Anti-License clause of the State Constitution. In Michigan, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and other States its aggressions contributed to the annulment of the old Prohibitory laws. During the important decade of 1870-80, while yet the full strength of Prohibitionists and anti-Prohibitionists alike was undeveloped, the Democratic party, deliberately and in many cases without apparent provocation or inducement, laid the foundations for the systematic operations of the future.

UTTERANCES OF NATIONAL CONVENTIONS.

The first distinct declaration against Prohibition by a Democratic National Convention was made in the centennial year of 1876 (June 28), when Samuel J. Tilden was nominated for the Presidency. The platform adopted by that Convention contained the following words:

> "In the absolute acquiescence to the will of the majority, the vital principle of republics; in the supremacy of the civil over the military authority; in the total separation of the church and the State for the sake of civil and religious freedom; in the equality of all citizens before just laws of their own enactment; *in the liberty of individual conduct unvexed by sumptuary laws;* in the faithful education of the rising generation, that they may preserve, enjoy and transmit these best conditions of human happiness and hope, we behold the noblest products of a hundred years of changeful history; but while upholding the bond of our Union and great charter of these our rights, it behooves a free people to practice also the eternal vigilance which is the price of liberty. . . . We denounce the policy which thus discards the liberty-loving German and tolerates a revival of the coolie trade in Mongolian women, imported for immoral purposes."

The use of the word "sumptuary," while not recognized by impartial persons as legitimate in characterizing Prohibitory laws, is, when appearing in Democratic platforms, well understood by the public to have reference to liquor Prohibition alone.

The next Democratic National Convention (June 24, 1880), which nominated Gen. Winfield S. Hancock for President, inserted in its platform the three words, "No sumptuary laws." The National Convention of 1884 (July 10) nominated Grover Cleveland for President and declared: "We oppose sumptuary laws which vex the citizen and interfere with individual liberty." In 1888 the Democratic National Convention (June 7), accepting the programme indicated by President Cleveland's policy, adopted a platform devoted almost exclusively to the tariff issue; and no distinct utterance on the liquor question appeared in it. But the following words were construed as repeating the "anti-sumptuary" utterance: "The Democratic party of the United States, in National Convention assembled, renews the pledge of its fidelity to Democratic faith and reaffirms the platform adopted by its representatives in the Convention of 1884." This construction was afterwards sanctioned by Henry Watterson, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions, who wrote in a letter to Walter B. Hill of Macon, Ga.: "The platform of 1888 reaffirms all the platform of 1884, making a special interpretation of the tariff clause of the former." And John G. Carlisle, Speaker of the House of Representatives, said in an interview in the *Voice* for June 14, 1888: "The Convention reaffirmed the platform of 1884. That platform contained an anti-sumptuary plank. The failure to speak definitely this time makes no change in the party."[1]

The record of the Democratic National Conventions is in harmony with that made by the party in Congress and the other branches of the Federal Government, both while in the ascendancy and while in the minority. (See UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.)

In examining the course of the Democrats in the States it is requisite to view the States of the South and those of the North separately.

ATTITUDE IN THE SOUTH.

In the South the Democratic party is regarded as more friendly to the demands of the temperance people than the Republican party. The former embraces a very large majority of the native-born whites, and undoubtedly contains much the largest proportion of the better classes of the dominant race. With increasing ardor and emphasis these classes have insisted upon the enactment of Prohibitory measures. Reasons of public policy have also contributed to spread Prohibition feeling in the South; the experience of communities in that section where the saloon has been successfully outlawed has invariably shown that Prohibition lessens crime, diminishes poverty and improvidence and prevents race conflicts. Again, the Democratic party's theory of government lays stress upon the right of each locality to administer its own affairs with full freedom; and a stubborn refusal to permit the people to exercise Prohibitory powers where strong sentiment exists, is manifestly not in accord with such a theory. In consequence of these and other influences the Democratic party in the South has enacted a great deal of Local Option legislation, many leaders of the party have exhibited pronounced sympathy for the principle of Prohibition, Democratic voters have established (or helped to establish) the policy over extensive areas, and Democratic officials have been compelled to respect public sentiment and enforce the laws.[2] (For particulars of the Local Option laws of the South and the extent to which Prohibition has been adopted under them, see LEGISLATION and LOCAL OPTION.)

But in giving due credit to the Democratic party for these results, its serious shortcomings must not be overlooked. Very little progress has been made in the South towards a homogeneous and comprehensive Prohibition policy. No Southern State has ever enacted a complete Prohibitory law with adequate enforcement provisions. In no Southern State has the Democratic party permitted its representatives in Conventions or Legislatures to champion State Prohibition. In the four States of the South—Texas, Tennessee, West Virginia and North Carolina—where Prohibitory Constitutional Amendments have been submitted to the people, the more influential managers of the Democratic party have entered into alliance with the liquor traffic to defeat the propositions. For this hostility to radical measures there is, perhaps, still less justification than for Republican hostility in the North: the social and political problems in the South are graver by far, and the solution of race and educational questions is confessedly interfered with in a most serious way by the influence of the liquor traffic. Besides, taking the South as a whole, the traffic is in no wise so threatening or so powerful there as in the North, and its ability to work mischief to the political party attacking it is not so great. The foreign-born whites in the South constitute but a comparatively insignificant element of the population. Conditions justifying aggression are, therefore, emphatically more encouraging to the Democratic party in the South than to the Republican party in the North; yet Southern legislation against the liquor traffic is nowhere to be compared with that prevailing in the representative Prohibition States of the North. This difference is undoubtedly due to the tenaciousness with which the more positive Democrats cling to the doctrine of local self-government, oppose the tendency towards centralization and "paternal governments," maintain that the world is already "governed too much," and advocate the ideas of individual responsibility and so-called "personal liberty." It is also worthy of consideration that the advocates of complete Prohibition in the South have not generally favored the Prohibition party method or pressed that method so aggressively as to endanger Democratic supremacy and thus wring concessions from the dominant party. It is true the party Prohibitionists have at times shown considerable activity in certain parts of the South, but they have not in many instances been strong enough to inspire the Democrats with alarm.

---

[1] The Convention of 1888 was earnestly petitioned, by Southern temperance leaders, to repudiate the former opposition of the party to Prohibition legislation. The petitioners were shown no favor and little courtesy.

[2] The results in the South, however (especially in respect of enforcement), are imperfect and unsatisfactory in the same sense that Local Option results are so in the North.

The Democratic politicians of the South were not slow to perceive the value of the High License compromise, and High License laws have been established in several States of that section, the object being, as in the North, to satisfy moderate temperance people without extinguishing the liquor traffic.

ATTITUDE IN THE NORTH.

Turning now to the Northern States, we find that in them the record of the Democratic party is a record of open and unremitted advocacy of the easiest terms for the saloon. This is true as a general statement, and more is to be said: since the Civil War the Democratic party in every State of the North has stood each year for the mildest form of liquor legislation desired by the traffic at large. We have already alluded to the deeds of the party in the decade 1870–80. In the ten years from 1880 to 1890, while political interest in the Prohibition movement steadily grew, the Democratic organizations in every part of this section became more and more identified with the liquor traffic.

In all the more important States that voted on Prohibitory Amendments in this period, the Democrats first opposed the right of the people to pass verdict upon the liquor traffic at the ballot-box, then openly and offensively opposed the Amendments in the electoral campaigns. It is true that in Oregon the Democratic party assented to submission and the Democratic counties of that State showed a larger proportionate vote for the Amendment than the Republican counties; but Oregon forms the only exception. In each State adopting Constitutional Prohibition—Kansas, Iowa, Maine, Rhode Island, South Dakota and North Dakota—the Democratic party refused to accept the will of the people and advocated a return to license and Local Option. It is especially deserving of remark, however, that formal opposition by platform declaration was discontinued in Maine and Kansas after it became apparent to the Democratic leaders that the interests of the party would suffer by making ridiculous demands for license legislation in the teeth of overwhelming Prohibition sentiment.

Of the States that obtained Prohibitory laws before the war, Vermont and New Hampshire are the only ones (excepting Maine) that have steadily maintained those laws on the statute-books. In both Vermont and New Hampshire the Democrats have perseveringly declared for the destruction of the Prohibitory acts.

The Northern States in which the Democratic party is strongest and has been able more frequently than in the others to outvote the Republicans and control legislation—New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Ohio, Indiana and California—are the States where the loosest liquor systems prevail and where the wishes of the trade at large have been most respected. (Of course in making this comment we do not intimate that the pretended restrictive and High License legislation in other Northern States has by results proved more advantageous to real temperance interests than the milder systems of New York, New Jersey, etc. But this [so-called] stricter legislation represents concessions to a certain portion of the temperance element, and for that reason is possibly to be considered progressive. In the Democratic or semi-Democratic States, on the other hand, even the spirit of concession has made but little headway, and public feeling has been shaped almost exclusively by the expressed desires of the majority of the rumsellers.) In New York the Democrats have championed the most infamous license measures, especially the one proposing the repeal of the Sunday law; and bills advocated by representatives of very conservative temperance sentiment—bills having little or no real temperance value, but objectionable to the small retail liquor-dealers because higher license rates were provided for in them,—have been repeatedly vetoed by Governor Hill for the sole purpose of solidifying the rum vote for the Democratic party. The Democratic majorities in the State of New York are distinctively saloon majorities, procured by the great power of the Tammany Hall organization in the slums of New York City. In New Jersey Democratic party conditions are practically the same as in New York: Democratic Legislatures and Governors have consistently refused to enact even the mildest temperance bills, and the County Local Option law of 1888, obtained after years of laborious effort, was promptly rescinded by the next Democratic Legislature. In Connecticut, although the peculiar laws of the State (requiring candidates to receive majorities of all the votes cast, instead of mere pluralities) have prevented the Democrats from securing control, their influence, in connection with that of the liquor Republicans, has been sufficient to check temperance progress. In Ohio the Democrats have since 1880 twice elected their State ticket and a majority of the legislators (1883 and 1889), and each time their success was due in great measure to their exceedingly offensive bids for saloon support, and the leadership of especially active pro-liquor statesmen—Hoadly in 1883 (who was a liquor-dealers' attorney), and Campbell in 1889 (who was an attorney for the brewers and who, as Chairman of the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic Committee in the National House of Representatives, had killed every temperance bill that came before the Committee). In Indiana and California the Democrats, while not wholly responsible for the State Government save at rare intervals, have always been very powerful and, acting with the controlling element of the Republican party, have made those States notorious for their practically unrestricted liquor traffic and their almost unrivalled stubbornness in refusing Local Option privileges. It is true that the Indiana Democrats have voluntarily taken a stand in recent years for higher license, and readily assisted to pass a higher license bill in the Legislature of 1889; and if they are entitled to credit for this action the preceding statement may be qualified accordingly.

In the other States of the North the Democratic party has uniformly fought every effort for progressive (or supposedly progressive) temperance legislation since the lines as now existing were drawn.

A thorough statement of the attitude of the Democrats in the various Northern States can be made in no way so satisfactorily as by summarizing the declarations of Democratic State platforms for several years. We find that in 1886 the Democratic Conventions in 11 Northern States (California, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Ohio, Vermont and Wisconsin) opposed Prohibition; in nine Northern States (Colorado, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island) they made no utterance on the temperance question; in two Northern States (Indiana and Iowa) they advocated Local Option or High License; in one Northern State (Oregon) the submission of a Prohibitory Amendment to the people was favored, and in one Northern State (New York) there was no Democratic Convention held. The Northern Democratic State platforms for 1887 give the following showing: Silent, Massachusetts, Michigan, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island—4; opposing Prohibition, Iowa, Nebraska, New York and Ohio—4; favoring High License or Local Option, Iowa and Nebraska—2; in the other Northern States there were no Democratic Conventions. The record for 1888 is as follows: Silent, California, Colorado, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon and Pennsylvania—11; opposing Prohibition, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island (1889), Vermont and Wisconsin—8; favoring High License or Local Option, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Rhode Island (1889)[1] and Vermont—4; berating the Republican party for its behavior in dealing with the liquor issue without making any distinct expression as to matters of principle, Connecticut and Maine—2.[2]

In this analysis it will be seen that the Democrats have favored Local Option or High License in the States of New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Iowa, Nebraska and Indiana. In the first four named States Prohibition was the law, and the Democrats, as a rum party, proposed the only alternative policy that public sentiment in those States was likely to tolerate; in Nebraska High License was indorsed because that policy was favored there by the unanimous consent of the men engaged in the traffic; in Indiana alone the declaration for High License was made under circumstances possibly entitling the party to credit for a progressive disposition, but the High License plank of 1886 in Indiana was a very tame one, simply advocating "a reasonable increase of the license tax," and making no reference to Local Option.

---

[1] The Rhode Island utterance of 1889 is included because it, rather than silence, represents the true attitude of the party in that State in 1888.

[2] Political Prohibitionist for 1887, 1888 and 1889.

The application of the foregoing review is exclusively to the Democratic party as an organization. Space does not permit a presentation in detail of the records and utterances of representative national and State leaders of the party. Incidental allusions have been made, in this article and others (see especially CONSTITUTIONAL PROHIBITION and UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC), to individual Democrats whose connection with events has been of much importance. No discussion of this subject, however, should fail to give due recognition to the many courageous Democrats who have braved the prevailing sentiment of their party and supported the principle of Prohibition. Few names of Prohibition advocates are more familiar or respected than those of Senator A. H. Colquitt of Georgia, the late Henry W. Grady of the same State, Gen. Samuel F. Cary of Ohio and ex-Senator S. B. Maxey of Texas—all Democratic leaders of prominence. Other Democrats in and out of public life, representing every State of the Union, have contributed and are contributing zealously and effectively to the promotion of the cause. The Prohibition party, the most radical wing of the Prohibition movement, has drawn many of its ablest leaders from the Democratic party, including the man remembered as the foremost of party Prohibitionists, John B. Finch.

Denmark.[1]—This Kingdom, embracing the small northern European peninsula of Jutland and a group of islands in the Baltic Sea, with an aggregate population of about 2,000,000, has been regarded as the most drunken of civilized nations. This view, as respects distilled liquors at least, seems to be confirmed by all reliable statistical estimates. (See CONSUMPTION OF LIQUORS.) There is no doubt, however, that temperance sentiment is increasing materially. The reports made at the annual meeting of the Denmark Temperance Society in 1889 showed that there were then 19,814 members of that organization—12,658 males and 7,156 females. It is claimed that the Good Templars have a membership of between 6,000 and 7,000 in Denmark; and Rev. Carl F. Eltzholtz, in a recent letter in the *Union Signal*, estimated the number of total abstainers in the Kingdom at 35,000. The Government makes appropriations of money to encourage the temperance organizations. A movement against spirits began before 1840, being started by Dr. Robert Baird of Massachusetts. The Good Templar organization was founded in 1881. Besides the National Total Abstinence League there is an Association for Promoting Sobriety that has the coöperation of eminent men; and Sunday-closing and coffee-house movements are on foot, although most of the Danish coffee-houses sell beer.

The richer classes of Denmark use wine freely. Beer is consumed by persons of all classes save the abstainers, and strong spirits are also popular.

The quantities of distilled spirits produced, imported and consumed in Denmark for a series of years are given in our article on CONSUMPTION OF LIQUORS. It is estimated that the annual production of beer is from 25,000,000 gallons upwards. No Prohibitory or really restrictive legislation has been enacted, although the city of Copenhagen requires dramshops to close at midnight, prohibits the employment of barmaids and directs that liquor-sellers shall see that their inebriated customers have free rides home or are carried to police stations in covered vehicles. No special license is required for the sale of liquors, but a small annual tax must be paid by each proprietor as a shop-keeper. Danish statistics credit about one-tenth of the accidents, an eighth of the lunacy, over a third of the pauperism and 76 per cent. of the arrests to drink. Recently the Danish Medical Society has declared the injurious tendency of brandy and beer upon the human system.[1]

---

[1] The editor is indebted to M. J. Cramer of East Orange, N. J.

A humane policy is pursued by the Danish Government in regulating the affairs of its dependencies in the Arctic waters. The commerce of Greenland is a Danish monopoly, made so, in part, to prevent the introduction of spirits. Iceland, famous for the ruggedness and intelligence of her people, has no breweries or distilleries, but small quantities of wine, beer and whiskey are imported. Comparatively few of the people have the means to buy intoxicants, there is little drunkenness, crime is rare and the moral character of the inhabitants is good. In the Faroe Islands conditions are practically the same as in Iceland. Santa Croix, the well-known Danish island of the West Indies, and other colonies of Denmark in that group, produce large quantities of sugar and molasses, from which the celebrated Santa Croix rum is distilled. The inhabitants consume but little of this liquor, most of it being exported. There is no restriction on its production or sale, the Government encouraging the industry for revenue reasons.

Dipsomania, or the thirst mania; a term applied to the diseased condition of body and mind attendant upon an irresistible and insatiable thirst for alcoholic liquors. When the drinker is so incapable of controlling his appetite as to be habitually intemperate (whether periodically or continuously so), he is described scientifically as a dipsomaniac, and it is for the drinker of this class that the inebriate asylum exists.

Direct Veto.—See GREAT BRITAIN.

Disciple Church.—The General Christian Missionary Convention, composed of delegates representing the "Disciples" of all the States and Territories, was held in Louisville, Ky., October, 1889. The following resolution was unanimously adopted:

> "RESOLVED, That it is the mature conviction of the Christian workers of this Convention that the liquor traffic is one of the greatest hindrances to the spread of the gospel, the purity of the churches and the material and moral welfare of the people; and as such it is our most sacred duty to oppose its deadly influence and to seek its entire suppression by such means as, in our judgment, may prove most effectual."

Distillation.—The process by which a liquid, after being confined in a closed vessel, heated and vaporized, and subsequently reconverted to the fluid state in a colder connecting vessel or tube, is obtained in a purified form. If contaminated water be placed in a retort and a degree of heat slightly above the boiling point of water be applied, the various impure elements, not being convertible into vapor at that comparatively low temperature, will remain as solids at the bottom of the retort; while the escaping steam, passing to the mouth of the retort, will be condensed upon contact with the colder temperature and the resulting liquid will be a perfectly pure water. Water from which impurities are thus eliminated is called distilled water.

Distillation as a commercial process is employed chiefly for obtaining alcoholic spirits. Any vegetable or animal substance in passing through the stages of decomposition undergoes fermentation. When the so-called stage of vinous fermentation is reached, alcohol is generated. If the substance is grain (as barley) or fruit (as grapes), the liquid at this stage becomes beer or wine, in which the intoxicating element of alcohol remains in a diluted form, the chief constituent of the solution being water. To concentrate the alcohol the mixture must be subjected to distillation. Alcohol boils at 173° F., and water at 212°; therefore under a heat between these points the alcohol is separated from the water and other ingredients and passes off as vapor. The mixture is heated in a large copper boiler or still, to which is attached a long spiral tube or "worm" surrounded by cold water. The cold condenses the alcohol vapor, which falls into a vessel placed to receive it. This first distillation is not a perfect success, for the affinity between alcohol and water is so strong that the two liquids are carried over in about equal parts, the compound being technically called "proof spirits." To obtain stronger alcohol distillation must be repeated three or four times, and even then from 10 to 20 per cent. of water commonly remains. The distilling process, when thus repeated, is called "rectification."

---

[1] On the authority of Joseph Malins of Manchester, Eng.

There seems to be but little doubt that the ancient Chinese understood and practiced distillation many centuries before the Christian era. (See CHINA.) The Chinese records relate that the discoverer (Iti) was disgraced, and that his name was held in loathing by subsequent generations. To the rest of the civilized world distillation was unknown until the art was gradually introduced from Arabia, where it was discovered in the 11th Century A. D. by Albucasis, a chemist.

Theoretically the more popular strong liquors of commerce are obtained by distillation direct—brandy by distilling wine, whiskey and rum by distilling macerated grain, molasses, potatoes, etc. But in practice liquor is not always so derived. Raw alcohol, highly concentrated, is used for its manufacture, the crude article being specially treated in order to produce special beverages—*i. e.*, treated by adulteration or processes akin to that, the sole object being not to prepare an honest liquor but a marketable imitation. And in the eager desire to procure the maximum quantity of spirits from the minimum quantity of grain or other material used, the conditions governing the production of honest alcohol are overridden. The common beverage alcohol of commerce, known as ethylic alcohol, is only one of a family of alcohols, each member of which (with the one exception of methylic alcohol) is far more injurious to the health of man than the ethylic alcohol. To separate these more dangerous alcohols from the material distilled higher temperatures are required: while ethylic alcohol is obtained at 173° F., the production of propylic alcohol requires 205°, that of butylic alcohol 228°, and that of amylic alcohol (fusel oil) 270°. Propylic alcohol, the first of the three last-named, having a comparatively low boiling-point (below that of water) is separated in considerable quantities during the process of distillation. Though more deleterious than the ethylic, it is not so poisonous as the butylic or amylic, which having higher boiling-points need not be generated in very large amounts if the temperature is kept down and the distillation discontinued after the ethylic product has been evaporated. But in practice these butylic and amylic corruptions are introduced into the distilled spirits by raising the temperature and continuing the heat; and instead of eliminating them by redistillation, unscrupulous distillers simply neutralize their taste by chemical means. The effects of liquor in which these heavier alcohols are present are frightful. Their presence can be readily detected by a simple experiment. Let a quantity of the suspected spirits be placed in a vessel and ignited; if a plate or glass, held over the flame, becomes discolored with a black deposit, it is to be concluded that the heavier alcohols exist in the liquor, for ethylic alcohol yields no such deposit when burned.

Distilled Liquors.—See SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS.

District of Columbia.—See Index.

Divorce.—An exceedingly valuable statistical work on "Marriage and Divorce" was issued by the United States Department of Labor (Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner), in 1889. It is the result of special investigations inaugurated by the Divorce Reform League, presents a digest of laws governing marriage and divorce, and gives statistics covering 20 years. These statistics show the number of divorces granted in that period in the various States of the Union, together with the causes. Taken as a whole, however, unless considered in connection with various circumstances, the statistics of causes for divorce are of comparatively little value. That 20 per cent. of the divorces were granted for adultery, 38 for desertion, 16 for cruelty and only 4.2 for drunkenness proves little, since the condition of the statutes, facility of proof, and personal considerations have great influence in the determination of the alleged causes.

The connection of intemperance with divorce was made a special point in the study of 29,670 cases. The 4.2 per cent. given above is manifestly unreliable; for in no less than nine States, including some of the most populous, intemperance is not a legal cause of divorce. But from 45 selected counties in 12 representative States, in all of which it is a cause, a far different result was obtained. Here out of 29,665 cases, "intemperance was a direct or indirect cause" in 5,966 or 20.1 per cent. of all examined, or 24.3 per cent. of the 24,586 in which a specific answer was given to the question concerning its presence. In one-sixth of the cases the facts were reported as unknown. But some remarks should be made here.

1. The allegations of the libels often assert the existence of several causes, using any in which proof is thought possible. Sometimes, but more rarely, a real cause is omitted. Perhaps adultery most frequently comes under this latter class, and desertion doubtless covers many unnamed causes. But intemperance could hardly be made to appear in double the per cent. of the cases given, for it is doubtless used freely in most allegations.

2. Rarely is a divorce, a crime or any other effect of a social evil, due to a single cause. Probably several causes contribute to a large part of divorces. We can only say, therefore, what the careful language of Mr. Wright implies, that intemperance appeared as *a* contributing cause in 20 or 24 per cent. of the divorces. This influence may range all the way from the least appreciable amount to the dominant or even sole cause. In a word, here as elsewhere in social statistics, both the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the several and often complex causes must be made. As a coin by its mere size may be valued at 5 cents, but be worth 25 cents or $5 if its quality be considered, so it is with statistical estimates of the causes of divorce or crime. Scientific statistics have just begun to treat these matters properly.

Attention should be directed to the statistics of the report regarding intemperance and divorce in certain States to guard against false conclusions. For example, divorces for drunkenness in Iowa were only 6.3 per cent. of the whole number in the five years 1867–71, but became 8.8 per cent. in the five years 1882–6. In Maine, where under the Divorce law of 1883 divorces decreased greatly, there were 23 for intemperance in the first five years and also 23 in the single year 1886. In Connecticut there were in the first five years only 65 divorces for intemperance out of a total of 2,314; but in the last five years there were 388 out of only 1,933. Now, no hasty conclusions regarding Prohibition in the former States or Local Option in Connecticut should be drawn from these striking figures. Popular sympathy for the victims of drunken spouses may have led to the utmost use of intemperance as a ground of divorce in Maine and Iowa; while a study of the Connecticut tables will show that since the repeal of the "omnibus" clause in 1878, and it became necessary to prove something more specific than general misconduct, the statutory cause of drunkenness has been made to do full service.

There is still another side to this subject: the relation of divorce to intemperance, suicide, sexual vices and industrial conditions, as well as to its effect on the individual, the family and society. Like every other social evil, divorce is at once both cause and effect. Unhappily, little material for exact knowledge is obtainable M. Kummer of the Swiss Bureau of Statistics found that "the proportion of crime committed by divorced men is from eight to ten times greater than the general average." "The tendency to suicide on the part of men who have been divorced is more pronounced than that of widowers," says Bortellon. Morselli found more than five times as many suicides among the divorced of both sexes in Würtemburg as among the married, and more than six times as many among divorced men in Saxony.

Further statistical study on the broad foundations laid by the remarkable report of Mr. Wright should be made. The occupation of divorced persons, their religion, vices, crime, local residence, remarriage, repetition of divorces, the lapse of time between the dissolution of one marriage and the contracting of another, the effect on property and children, are all important sociological points and many of them are probably within the range of practical statistics. Uniform laws would remove many difficulties, though migration to obtain divorce cover a small part of the divorces of the country. Both constitutional amendment and concurrent state legislation have been urged. New York has a commission in the interests of the latter. Should this prove inadequate, we can resort to the former with important gains.

S. W. DIKE.

Doctors.—See MEDICINE.

Dodge, William Earl.—Born in Hartford, Conn., Sept. 4, 1805, and died in New York City, Feb. 9, 1883. His father removed to New York City in 1805, and William began his mercantile career there at the age of 13, working as a clerk for his father. When he reached manhood he engaged in the dry-goods business with a partner, on his own account, under the firm name of Huntington & Dodge. Three years later he married a daughter of Anson G. Phelps, and in 1833 became a partner in the firm of Phelps, Dodge & Co. Mr. Dodge was one of the first directors of the Erie Railroad, but resigned upon the refusal of the management to discontinue the Sunday traffic. For the same reason he severed his connection with the Jersey Central and with the Elevated Railroad of New York City. During the 30 years of his connection with the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad no Sunday trains were run. He was one of the founders of the Mutual Life Insurance Company, was for three years President of the New York Chamber of Commerce, and was a benefactor of Union Theological Seminary, a Manager of the American Bible Society and one of the originators of the Union League Club. He was among the strongest moneyed supporters of the Government in the Civil War, and was elected in 1866 a member of Congress. Appointed Indian Commissioner by President Grant, he visited the Western Territories and made himself familiar with every phase of the Indian question. Throughout his life and by his will at his death, he gave most liberally to philanthropic enterprises. He was a friend of the negro and a generous benefactor of Lincoln University for colored men. He helped to establish in New York City a Christian Home for Intemperate Men and a like institution for women. He was a total abstainer and his social eminence did not lead him to sacrifice his principles. While a member of the House of Representatives he was a member of the Congressional Temperance Society. He was the personal friend of John B. Gough, and expressed his sympathy for Neal Dow in the struggle for Prohibition in Maine. At the fifth American Temperance Convention, held at Saratoga, N. Y., Aug. 1, 1865, it was proposed to form two temperance societies, a National Society and a Publication House. But the two were subsequently merged in one, the National Temperance Society and Publication House, with headquarters in New York City, and Mr. Dodge was elected President of the organization, a position which he held continuously until his death. Mr. Dodge said in 1880:

> "Having watched the progress of the temperance reformation from its beginning, and the several crises which have from time to time secured fresh public attention and in each case carried the cause forward, I am now fully convinced that the next great battle is for Prohibition. This principle of the suppression of the traffic by popular vote, either through Constitutional Amendments, State and national, or by local Prohibition, is the question which the friends of temperance in this country are bound to press until public sentiment shall secure the result. It is not claimed that Prohibition will prevent all intemperance; but it will go far towards it by removing the public temptation. The license system is the chief obstacle in the way. It gives a kind of legal respectability to the business. The time must come when no Christian can maintain his standing in the church who will manufacture, sell or use intoxicating drinks, or vote for any party favoring income from license to sell poison."

Dougall, John.—Born in Paisley, Scotland, July 8, 1808, and died in New York City, Aug. 19, 1886. He received but a meagre school education, but he enlarged it greatly by general reading. In 1826, when 18 years old, he emigrated to Montreal, Canada, and entered the commission business. In 1832 he became a member of the Montreal Temperance Society. Under the preaching of Dr. Kirk of Boston, in 1838, he embraced religion, and in 1840, soon after his marriage, he joined a Congregational church. In addition to managing a large mercantile business Mr. Dougall for several years conducted the *Canada Temperance Advocate*, and in 1846 he started the Montreal *Witness*, which was published for ten years as a weekly, and afterwards was issued semi-weekly and later three times a week. In 1860 a daily edition was printed at a half-penny a copy, and although maintaining the religious character and temperance principles of the weekly, it attained a phenomenal circulation in a short time. Mr. Dougall believed daily papers of similar character could be successfully conducted in other cities, and he conferred with editors of religious weekly newspapers and talked to large gatherings on this subject. A gentleman of means encouraged him to start such a journal in New York City, and accordingly in 1871 the New York *Daily Witness* was begun. But it was never self-sustaining, and in 1878, when it had almost acquired a paying circulation, it was discontinued. The New York *Weekly Witness,* on the contrary, was a great success almost from its first publication in 1872, although its advocacy of the Prohibition party, in 1884, was made at a heavy sacrifice. In 1876 the *Sabbath Reading* was inaugurated and soon became successful; but *Gems of Poetry,* started in 1880, was abandoned after a few years. The *Pioneer,* established by Mr. Dougall in 1885, and devoted exclusively to the advocacy of the principles of the Prohibition party, is one of the chief Prohibition papers.

Dow, Neal, third candidate of the Prohibition party for President of the United States; born in Portland, Me., March 20, 1804. His father and mother were Quakers. He received his education in the Portland public schools, the Academy at Portland and the Friends' Academy at New Bedford, Mass. A total abstainer from his youth, at the age of 21 he became a member of the Maine Charitable Mechanic Association and fought his first battle for temperance by opposing the admission of a rumseller who had applied for membership in the Association. A protracted discussion ensued, finally resulting in the rejection of the applicant. Mr. Dow's labors have won for him the title of "Father of the Maine Law." He was identified more prominently than any other person with the movement that led to the passage of the first State Prohibitory law. Determined to arouse a public sentiment that should outlaw the drink traffic in Maine, he devoted many years to canvassing the State. He sometimes secured two or three good speakers, and carried them with him on extended tours giving lectures, holding mass-meetings, and scattering temperance documents. Maine's Prohibitory act of 1846 was the first fruit of these efforts. This measure was not very effective from the fact that it made no adequate provision for the punishment of law-breakers or for the seizure of liquors illegally held for sale; but under the inspiration of Mr. Dow's example the temperance advocates throughout the State continued the agitation to amend it. A Legislature pledged to Prohibition was finally chosen. Mr. Dow, at that time Mayor of Portland, drafted a bill that he believed would be effective. By its terms the manufacture, sale and keeping for sale of intoxicating liquors were forbidden; liquors kept for sale were to be seized, confiscated and destroyed; no action could be maintained for the recovery of liquors thus confiscated, and there could be no property in such liquors; cases arising under this act were to take precedence in the Courts over all others except cases where the persons on trial were actually in waiting in confinement; cases could not be continued for trial, nor could sentence be postponed, and action was to be immediate; the penalties of fine or imprisonment named in the act were invariably to be imposed on convicted persons, and were not to be lightened, directly or indirectly, by the Court; liquors for medicinal purposes, or for use in manufactures or the arts, were to be sold by an agent especially appointed in each town, who should have no pecuniary interest in the sales made; the act was to go into effect as soon as approved by the Governor. Mr. Dow submitted this bill to some of the leading temperance men of Portland, who declared it improbable that such a measure would be passed by the Legislature. He arrived in Augusta, the State capital, April 29, 1851—two days before adjournment. The next morning he requested the Speaker of the House to immediately appoint a committee to consider his bill, and to grant a hearing that afternoon. The request was granted both in the House and in the Senate. In the afternoon the Legislature adjourned to give him a hearing. The hall was crowded. He spoke for an hour and presented the bill. It was rushed to the printer (who, curiously enough, was a rumseller), and passed by a vote of 86 to 40 in the House and 18 to 10 in the Senate. Governor Hubbard, a Democrat, signed the act June 2, 1851, and Mr. Dow's bill became the famous Maine law. The interest in the new measure centered in Portland, the metropolis of the State, where Mr. Dow was Mayor. He quietly announced that the law would be enforced, and issued a proclamation allowing liquor-dealers a reasonable time to transport their goods to other States, but warning them not to sell in Portland. In a short time Portland's saloons had ceased to exist, some of them being closed up and others converted into reputable places of business. Mr. Dow prepared quarterly reports on the workings of Prohibition, containing unanswerable proofs of the successful enforcement of the law. In 1861 he recruited a regiment, the 13th Maine Volunteers, and entered the army. He was made a Brigadier-General by President Lincoln in April, 1862, and was twice wounded in battle. He has visited England three times, delivering about 500 addresses under the auspices of the United Kingdom Alliance. As the candidate of the Prohibition party for President in 1880 he received 9,678 votes.

Druggists.—The relations of the druggist's calling to the practical aspects of the drink question are of much importance. The prevailing practice of most physicians, who prescribe alcohol and alcoholic liquors to patients, makes it necessary for pharmacists to keep stocks of alcohol and the various popular beverages. Prohibitory laws, even the most stringent, have not discriminated against the privilege of physicians to so prescribe or the right of druggists to vend on physicians' prescriptions—indeed, all Prohibitory acts specially exempt alcoholic liquors used for "medicinal purposes." But the disposition of unscrupulous physicians and druggists to abuse their powers is guarded against in such acts by restrictions and penalties more or less severe: in some cases, as in Kansas and the Dakotas, the pharmacy features of the Prohibitory laws are so rigid that druggists cannot safely attempt frequent evasions in any community where there is a disposition to enforce legal provisions, violations subjecting the offending druggist to fine, imprisonment and deprivation for a number of years of his certificate as a pharmacist. On the other hand the term "medicinal purposes" is capable of being made to cover illegitimate sales, so long as the physician has full discretion; and a conscienceless druggist co-operating with a conscienceless physician may, under favorable local conditions and for a while, at least, make his pharmacy business a mere cloak for catering to the drink appetite and amassing profits. Experience under all Prohibitory systems has shown that the "drug-store saloon" is one of the chief obstacles in the way of complete success; but under a rigid law like that of Kansas the difficulty is everywhere greatly lessened, and in communities where the officers of the law are faithful it can be and is entirely removed. Hearty co-operation has at times been given by reputable pharmacists toward bringing offenders to justice; but the general attitude of the pharmacy trade is not everywhere so satisfactory as is to be desired—in fact, pharmacists frequently complain bitterly against rigid restrictions, and in certain instances have become identified with the anti-Prohibition element.

The responsibility for drug-store violations rests, in the main, upon the medical profession, and is especially chargeable to the general belief that alcoholic liquors are essentials of the pharmacopœia. There is, however, a growing opinion among scientists that even if alcohol has a necessary place in medical practice there is no necessity for prescribing any of the alcoholic beverages of commerce. If this opinion were generally recognized and pure alcohol instead of the fascinating beverages were prescribed in all cases where alcoholic prescription is deemed advisable, the temptation to pharmacists that is incidental to Prohibitory laws would practically disappear; for the demand for pure alcohol as a beverage is at present so insignificant as not to be taken into account.

In the license States the sale of alcoholic liquors by druggists is, generally speaking, practically unrestricted. In addition to the annual fee of $25 charged by the United States Government, druggists pay in some States a nominal local fee (for example, $1 per year in Massachusetts) required by State law. Several of the representative Local Option States provide special pharmacy regulations for Prohibitory districts. But sales of liquor by the drink are, as a rule, permitted with but slight restrictions. Prominent drug-stores in all the great license cities have an extensive patronage from persons who never enter saloons and would consider it compromising to take their drams over an ordinary bar.

[For legislative provisions concerning druggists in the various States, see LEGISLATION.]

Drunkenness.—For particulars of the influence exercised by various legislative systems toward increasing or diminishing drunkenness, see HIGH LICENSE and PROHIBITION, BENEFITS OF.

Dutch Reformed Church.—No action on Prohibition was taken by the General Synod of this church in 1888 or 1889. The latest deliverance was made at Catskill, N. Y., June, 1887, the following resolutions being adopted:

> "1. That this Synod reiterates the deliverance of former Synods on the subject of temperance, and urges increased interest and zeal throughout the denomination in gospel temperance work.
>
> "2. That we especially and heartily sympathize with the work of the W. C. T. U., and bid the Union God-speed in the noble effort to rescue men from the curse of strong drink."

Edgar, John.—Born in Ballynahinch, Ireland, in 1798; died in Belfast, Ireland, Aug. 26, 1866. His father was a Presbyterian clergyman in Ballynahinch, and for many years was in charge of the academy from which the son graduated. The young man finished his college course at Glasgow University and studied theology in Belfast, where in 1820 he was ordained pastor of a "mission" church. His energy and power as a preacher rapidly built up his church, but eventually he resigned its pastorate to fill the chair of Systematic Theology in the Presbyterian Theological College at Belfast. Upon the union of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland in 1840, Dr. Edgar was made Divinity Professor of the united church. In 1842 he became Moderator of the General Assembly and succeeded in securing a fund for the establishment of Christian institutions in Southern and Western Ireland. During the potato famine of 1846 he labored zealously for the relief of the people, raising money for the starving, introducing industrial schools for the training of the youth, sending out missionaries and inciting to benevolence among the gentry. In temperance work he was one of the most conspicuous persons of his time in Great Britain, and he was the father of the reform in Ireland, the first temperance organization in that country having had its origin in a letter written by him and published in the Belfast *News-Letter*, Aug. 14, 1829. Six days later a society was formed at New Ross in County Wexford. A second letter was published in the *News-Letter*, Sept. 4 and 11, and afterwards was issued as a tract. In his second letter, speaking of the first one, he said that "a number of contemporary journals have cheerfully published my communication on behalf of temperance, and many men of rank and position of the first eminence are hearty in the matter." On Sept. 24, at Belfast, the Ulster Temperance Society was organized, Dr. Edgar being one of the original six signers of the constitution. In October, 1829, he preached the first of a series of temperance sermons in the Methodist Chapel, Donegal Square, Belfast, and by the close of the year 25 temperance societies had been founded in Ireland, with a total membership of 800. In 1829 he issued "An Address to the Temperate" (Dublin), while "The Intoxicating Drinks of the Hebrews" (Belfast, 1837), and "Scriptural Temperance" (Belfast, 1837), were his contributions to the Bible Wines controversy. He also introduced Dr. Lyman Beecher's "Six Sermons on Intemperance" to the British public. His usefulness in the later development of temperance reform in Great Britain was, however, seriously interfered with by his opposition to the total abstinence movement and to Father Mathew's remarkable pledge-signing crusade in Ireland. "Scriptural Temperance" and his "Limitations of Liberty" were written expressly to combat the agitation for total abstinence, and while they could not turn back the popular tide they served to rob their author of sympathy and active participation in the new phase of the reform almost until his death. He wished to limit temperance efforts to opposition to the spirit traffic, and in 1847 made final strenuous efforts to carry back the agitation in Ireland to this basis, but without success. Toward the close of his life he became reconciled to the change in sentiment, if not its pronounced advocate, and in 1855, as Moderator, signed an Address on Temperance, from the Committee of the Irish Presbyterian Assembly, unquestionably prepared by himself, in which total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors was favored. Again in 1861 he published a paper on the "Relation between Temperance and the Religious Revival," in which he manifested a disposition to tolerate and commend the total abstinence movement.

Educational Laws.—See LEGISLATION and SCIENTIFIC TEMPERANCE EDUCATIONAL LAWS.

Edwards, Justin.—Born in Westhampton, Mass., April 25, 1787, and died in Bath Alum, Va., July 23, 1853. He graduated from Williams College in 1810. He became pastor of the Congregational Church at Andover, Mass., in 1812, and remained in charge for 15 years. In 1828 he was appointed pastor of the Salem street church of Boston, but he resigned in 1829 to become General Secretary of the American Temperance Society which he served for seven years, delivering addresses, organizing branch societies and preparing his six reports of the Society from 1831 to 1836, which were afterwards published in a volume entitled "The Permanent American Temperance Documents." Dr. Dawson Burns characterizes Dr. Edwards as "beyond all question the ablest organizer and promoter of the original temperance movement in America." ("Temperance History," vol. 1, p. 368.) The formation of "The American Society for the Promotion of Temperance," at Boston on Feb. 13, 1826, marks the beginning of organized effort against liquor-drinking, and Dr. Edwards was foremost among the founders of this Society. During the previous year he had written a widely-circulated tract on the "Well-Conducted Farm," in which he described the successful experiment of a farmer who prohibited the use of spirits on his farm in spite of the well-nigh universal custom. The radical position taken from the first by the doctor and his colleagues in the American Temperance Society is shown by the declaration, made a part of the constitution in 1826, that the principal object of the temperance movement was not the reformation of the intemperate, however desirable that might be, but the *prevention* of intemperance. During his career as Corresponding Secretary and General Agent of this Society Dr. Edwards inaugurated a temperance movement in Washington which spread to Congress and resulted in establishing the Congressional Temperance Society; and on Aug. 31, 1830, he delivered the first temperance address in St. John's, New Brunswick, leading to the formation of the St. John's Temperance Society, one of the earliest in Canada. After his resignation he was for six years President of Andover Theological Seminary. From 1842 until 1849 he labored for Sabbath observance as zealously as he had for temperance. Of four tracts (two of them on temperance) written by him and published by the American Tract Society, more than 750,000 copies were printed up to 1857. They are entitled: the "Well-Conducted Farm;" "On the Traffic in Ardent Spirits;" "Joy in Heaven Over One Sinner that Repenteth," and "The Way to be Saved." Of his "Temperance Manual" 193,625 copies, and of his "Sabbath Manual" 583,544 copies were distributed. He prepared a commentary on the Bible, unfinished at the time of his death, which included all of the New and a part of the Old Testament.

Effects of Alcohol.—See ALCOHOL, EFFECTS OF.

Effects of High License.—See HIGH LICENSE.

Effects of Prohibition.—See PROHIBITION, BENEFITS OF.

Egypt.—See AFRICA.

England.—See GREAT BRITAIN.

Epilepsy.—This fearful disease is one of the maladies to which the excessive drinker is subject. It is most frequent among absinthe drinkers. "This [alcoholic] epilepsy," says Dr. B. W. Richardson, is "essentially characteristic. . . . The seizure usually occurs at first in the night and during sleep, and may not be distinguished by the sufferer himself from one of the many old attacks of what he probably calls night-mare. In time his friends become acquainted with the fact of the seizure or some evidence is left of it in the form of bruise or bitten tongue. Still later the attack occurs in the daytime, and then the precise nature of the disease is declared. In its early stages alcoholic epilepsy is comparatively easy of cure. It is cured sometimes spontaneously by simple total abstinence from alcohol. In its later stages it is, however, as incurable as any other type of this serious and intractable malady."[1]

---

[1] Diseases of Modern Life (New York, 1884), pp. 265-6.

Equal Suffrage.[1] — Only a few years ago I bitterly opposed Woman Suffrage. A wealthy widow, whose guest I was, said to me one election day: "Sir, do you think justice is done woman when my two gardeners, who have no property, are foreign-born and can scarcely speak English, have gone to the polls to vote for what, if carried, will add $500 to my taxes, and will place saloons along the pathway of my two boys, while I, who pay more taxes than any man in this county and am trying to raise my boys to be good and useful citizens, have no voice concerning what shall tax my property or affect the welfare of my children?" From that moment my views commenced changing and the sentiment of right which lies at the bottom of every conscience set up a leavening process. Old truths had new meanings. "Taxation without representation is tyranny"—women are taxed. "This is a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people"—women are people. "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed"—women are among the governed. "The depths of society are woman's depths—its heights should be her heights." "The wrongs of society are woman's wrongs—its rights should be her rights."

Is it right that native-born women, with finest gifts of mind and graces of character, who have inherited the purest principles of government, guarded the country's patriotism and helped to raise its revenues, should be disfranchised, while foreign-born men, ignorant of our language and laws and regardless of morals, can express themselves in the strongest sense of citizenship? In a land where "liberty" is the watchword, is it right that woman should be a slave to laws which tax her, try her, imprison her and hang her, without any voice as to the justice of these laws or the character of the men elected to enforce them? The perpetuity of the Republic depends upon the virtue and intelligence of its people. Have men all the virtue? Do women fill the saloons and gambling-houses, and crowd the street corners, polluting the air with oaths, obscenities, and tobacco-smoke? Do men fill the churches and gather the children about the home altars? What about intelligence? Do men possess all of this saving element? The record of our high schools tell us that two girls graduate for one boy. Then if upon virtue and intelligence depends the perpetuity of the Republic, and women have the preponderance of these saving influences, why withhold from them a share in the political life of the nation?

Some say the ballot would soon lower the high standard of woman's excellence. If woman's excellence is the result of her disfranchisement, then the ballot is degradation *per se*, and man should also be disfranchised that he may be elevated. Woman's excellence is not the result of disfranchisement but of the spiritual forces of her nature. The belief that enfranchisement would degrade woman is but another of the apprehensions which always meet radical changes. Henry Clay said immediate emancipation would result in the burning of Southern homes and dire disaster. Abraham Lincoln said in substance the same. "It won't work" has met every scientific invention, every radical reform. Within the past century hundreds of new fields have been opened to woman; let objectors name one where womanhood has been degraded, or one that has not been benefited and blessed by the touch of her influence, whether social, industrial, intellectual or political.

Many, prompted by a desire for woman's welfare, say: "It would be degrading to woman to have her enter the dirty pool of politics." That which has to do with the safety, morality and prosperity of the people ought not to be a "dirty pool." If it is, the sooner the cleansing power of woman's ballot is felt the better for the country. It will not be the first time she has had cleansing work to do. For centuries she has been cleaning dirty pools of tobacco spit, dirty floors, clothes and characters, and going through haunts of vice to reclaim her loved lost ones; and since she must endure the consequences of the "dirty pool" of politics, she should be allowed to turn the "dirty pool" into a crystal spring that its pure flow may give her purer associations. That this pool be cleaned is as much a domestic necessity as house-cleaning, and domestic purity demands the most potent means for the cleansing work. A sensible woman cannot appreciate the encomiums which on the fourth day of July place her but a little lower than the angels, when she knows that on election day she is classed with paupers, idiots and criminals.

---

[1] Since the three contributions embraced under this head are wholly controversial, the editor disclaims responsibility for all the opinions expressed. The appearance of such articles in this work is justified by the prominence given to certain aspects of the Woman Suffrage discussion in connection with the Prohibition movement.

It is also said: "Woman cannot devote sufficient time to a study of political questions to justify her having the ballot." The time she consumes in talking to her neighbor about the style of new bonnets would enable her to become as well posted on tariff as the average farmer, while her quickness of perception and moral sense would enable her to reach a knowledge of general questions at least equal to that possessed by the average voter who has about attained perfection, in the opinion of political leaders, when he votes the old party ticket, no matter what the platform or who the candidate.

The objection made by the politicians of Washington Territory, when women secured the ballot there, was this: "Woman is impracticable; she will not stick to party." But the record of her ballot shows that she did stick to principle. A leading journal of that Territory said: "The result of the late election shows that all parties must put up good men if they expect success." That there are bad women who will join bad men at the ballot-box may be true; but the proportion of bad is not so great among women as men, therefore advantage instead of harm will result.

The probable influence of Woman Suffrage upon the temperance reform can be no better indicated than by the following words of the Brewers' Congress held in Chicago, October, 1881:

> "Resolved, That we oppose always and everywhere the ballot in the hands of woman, for woman's vote is the last hope of the Prohibitionists."

Reading between the lines, this means also that woman's ballot is the death-knell of the liquor traffic. When the liquor-dealers and gamblers secured a decision adverse to woman's ballot from Judge Nash of Washington Territory they lit bonfires and rang bells, for it meant a loose rein to such as they. When in Rockford, Ill., a few years ago two boxes were prepared for a test of the sentiment of both sexes on the license question, the one containing the votes of men favored license, while the one containing the votes of women showed out of 2,000 votes only four for license, and into that box went the votes of Irish, Germans and Scandinavians, as well as of native-born women. Ex-Governor Hoyt of Wyoming, where women have had the ballot for 20 years, says: "Woman Suffrage gives us better laws, better officers, better institutions, better morals and a higher social condition." J. W. Kingman, ex-Judge of Wyoming, said: "Women make themselves felt at the polls as they do everywhere in society by an effectual discountenancing of the bad and a helping hand for the good and the true." In Kansas, enforcement of Prohibition was a failure in many places until municipal suffrage was conferred upon women, when at the first discharge of this pent-up moral power the saloon batteries of Kansas were silenced and a new emphasis was given to God's truth, "It is not good for man to be alone."

The principle of equal suffrage has been recognized in the platform of the Prohibition party since the first National Convention, and both principle and policy demand that it shall remain there. That the party should have but one idea is absurd; that it should have but one leading issue is right, and does not affect the Suffrage plank. No party ever goes before the country with only one idea, and yet never but one real issue absorbs the public thought. The Republican party had a number of planks in its platform of 1888, but protection was its rallying cry. The Democratic party had as many planks in its platform, but tariff reform was its shibboleth. The Prohibition party had an equal number of planks, but Prohibition was its watchword. Of all the hundreds of speeches made by Prohibitionists in the campaign of 1888, in every one Prohibition was the all-absorbing theme. No one proposes to make any other the leading issue. Miss Willard's "tandem team" with Prohibition in the lead, is advocated by every Suffragist in the party. The platform adopted at the last National Convention in Indianapolis, June, 1888, declares Prohibition to be "the dominant issue," and extends full fellowship in the party to all "who on this dominant issue are agreed."

We are told that a party is not needed

to secure equal suffrage—that it must come through education, agitation and petitioning. What is more educating and agitating than a political party on questions to be decided by politicians? What party should help on the education and agitation? That party which expects the benefit of woman's ballot when it is secured; that party which needs most woman's ballot to enforce its principles. Since the Prohibition party is the only party that can claim woman's ballot as its rightful inheritance, let us be careful not to sell it for a mess of pottage—the immediate control of a few votes.

While no other issue can take the place of Prohibition, we will need woman's ballot when the day of enforcement comes, and to keep it within reach is the part of policy as well as principle; for the speed of our progress is not so great a question as our ability to hold the land when it has come into our possession. To enforce Prohibition in our large cities a new saving force must be injected into our politics; and it does not exist outside of our women. If this comes not by the golden rule, alarming necessity will yet make it a war measure.

The day will come when the Prohibition party will need woman's ballot to secure enforcement of its purpose. The day will never come when old parties can adopt new great principles any more than could new wine go into old bottles. So what we already possess as a saving grace let us keep, and what we must finally have, in larger measure, let us cultivate, assured that the evolution in woman's rights will bring to woman the ballot. As out of the idea that a man of brain and heart and conscience is as good as any other man, though that man of brain and heart and conscience be a beggar and that other man a king, came this Republic; so out of the idea that a being of brain and heart and conscience is as good as any other being, though that being of brain and heart and conscience be a woman, and that other being a man, will come equal suffrage. The danger that this policy will heap upon the South female colored ignorance is met by the platform of the Prohibition party, which declares that "mental and moral qualification for the exercise of an intelligent ballot" ought to be the condition for male and female, and that the several States ought to decide the educational basis. This policy would place the ballot, North and South, East and West, upon that basis on which experienced men and historians make dependent the perpetuity of a Republic—virtue and intelligence.

George W. Bain.

Suffrage is the outward expression of the inward sense of self-protection and self-preservation. Suffrage is, therefore, a natural right; it comes of God and cannot be denied one-half the race by the other half without unwarranted usurpation of power. Suffrage is an expressed opinion upon matters vital to the life, liberty and happiness of the individual; without it no expression can be had upon the laws that affect person or property, and the persons thus denied are subject to the whims, caprices and impositions of those who make and administer the laws, The man or woman has never been born, and doubtless never will be, who is sufficiently just and Christian to be trusted with unlimited power over any other human being. Self-protection is, therefore, the only kind of protection to be trusted in the many emergencies of life.

All government is a usurpation except that which is based upon the consent of the governed. Suffrage is the instrument through which this consent is secured. Opponents of equal suffrage may urge, upon the broad grounds taken in the foregoing assertions, that children, idiots and criminals should be vested with the privilege of suffrage. The parent has a right, inherent with parentage, to represent and protect the child because of its inexperience and undeveloped mind; the idiot is irresponsible; the criminal is dangerous and has, therefore, forfeited his right to suffrage as a penalty for his misdeeds. None of these things—urged against child, idiot or criminal suffrage—can be justly urged against suffrage by the intelligent women.

Women have a right to suffrage upon the same grounds that men have, and the Declaration of Independence stands as a monument to male usurpation of power which thwarts the existence and ends of a true Republic, until women shall vote. To declare "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights;

that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," and then to deny one-half the people governed the power of consenting, is inconsistent.

One who believes in a government by the people must grant women suffrage or deny that women are "people." The opponent may urge that the stability of laws rests upon the power of enforcement, that back of the ballot is brute force and the bullet, and that the physical power of women is too limited to enforce their will power. Let it be remembered that if women cannot defend so they cannot attack; also, that it is as great a service to government to go down into the valley and shadow of death to give birth to a son and then rear him to manhood, as it is to go out upon the field of battle and shoot him.

In short, no objection can be urged against Woman Suffrage which, if carried to its logical conclusion, will not compel the objector to give up every declaration and principle upon which the Republic is founded, and disfranchise men. Therefore I conclude that ours is not a true Republic until women are allowed to vote, since natural right and justice demand that they exercise the elective franchise as freely and on the same terms as do men.

It is not my purpose to claim that by nature one sex is superior to the other in brain or moral power; but I am compelled to acknowledge that unequal social laws have made the women the superiors of men in intelligence, sobriety, loyalty and virtue. Reliable statistics show that there is a much higher percentage of educated women than of educated men. It is then expedient that women vote, for by this means only can laws reflect the highest degree of intelligence possessed by the people. There is but one drunken woman to every thousand drunken men; therefore the sober judgment of our citizens can be best secured by allowing clear-brained women at the polls. There is but one criminal woman to twelve criminal men; therefore the law-abiding, virtuous element of womanhood could so far outweigh and control the vicious and dangerous men who now vote, that every sentiment of patriotism demands the intelligence, sobriety and virtue of women at the ballot-box, as a balance of power.

History teaches that cities control the politics of nations, and through corruption of municipalities governments have been overthrown. American cities are at the present time controlled by the spawn of the saloon. There is but one reserve force upon which the Government can call to rescue the politics of the nation from the clutches of the vicious elements of society, namely, Woman Suffrage. It has all other responsible elements enfranchised. The three vices of the cities—the brothel, the gambling-den and the saloon—are the great enemies of the child and the home. Against these enemies the very nature of women is pitted in all the strength of their love for offspring and home. Prohibitory legislation will never prohibit, as it should, any or all of these vices, without the enforcing ballot of the great undeceased but unrecorded constituency in American politics, women. The lesson taught in Kansas, where women exercise municipal suffrage, is of unspeakable value and confirms the claim that Woman Suffrage is the great moral force that makes Prohibition prohibit.

The demoralizing influence of an injustice is reflex, demoralizing the perpetrators of such injustice. The slave of the South scarcely suffered more than the slaveholder and his descendants. Denying the mother-instinct of the nation expression, and the development that comes to the elector from the exercise of suffrage, has filled our almshouses, jails, asylums and penitentiaries with the waifs of society. Noble men stand appalled before the great crowd of indigent; and if in their search for remedial agencies they recognize that the tenderness of women, linked with the strength of men in legislation, is as necessary as the union of these two agencies in the home and society, the State will no longer suffer the fearful penalties of half-orphanage. Beside the breadwinners will stand the homemakers, each clothed with full power to supplement the other and solve the problem of life for the greatest good to the greatest number. The penalties of poverty, vice and crime upon us teach that suffrage needs women far more than women need suffrage.

The political party that pledges to legislate in the moral interests of the people must be supported by the moral force of women if it is to meet with success.

The Prohibition party is the only one in existence, at the present time, which presents in its platform a single moral principle. The other political parties struggle alone for office, greed and gain. The life and success of the Prohibition party depend upon the enfranchisement of women. The public sentiment which demands this party has grown from the organized and persistent efforts of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. The issues of the one are the issues of the other. It is, therefore, not only just that the Prohibition party declare and labor for Woman Suffrage, it is also expedient, as it is always expedient to act justly and do right. Time never fails to crown such acts with victory and honor.

Woman Suffrage is the logical sequence of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. Human liberty v. class rule is in the evolution of governments. Suffrage, the exponent of liberty, has already passed through the several class qualifications of orthodoxy, property and color in this country, and is now preparing to leave behind the last remnant of such legislation indicated by sex suffrage. HELEN M. GOUGAR.

Three leading questions must be considered:

1. Is Woman Suffrage in itself desirable?

2. If secured, would it assist the cause of Prohibition?

3. Assuming that it is desirable in itself, and that it would assist the cause of Prohibition, should it be advocated by the Prohibition party?

To the first question I must reply, Probably not. The question has never been before the public in such a form as to elicit any thorough discussion. The advocates of suffrage have dealt largely in assumptions and *ad captandum vulgus* arguments, and its opponents have relied upon the instinctive judgment of the community rather than upon clearly-defined reasons. It is probably better for all concerned that one-half the citizens, and the most esteemed and honored half, should stand aloof from common political strife, constituting a moral reserve whose influence, unselfish and unbiased, will be brought in to turn the scale in all important crises. The fact that many changes in woman's position have been effected without bringing the evils which were predicted, does not prove that suffrage would be a safe experiment. The boy cried "Wolf! wolf!" many times when there was no wolf there, but at last, when people had grown indifferent to the cry of alarm, the wolf actually came.

To the second question I must answer, Only slightly and temporarily. It is a great confession of weakness to assume that Prohibition cannot be carried as other reforms have been by manhood suffrage, and that the basis of suffrage must be changed in order to force it through. Conservative minds would hesitate to have Prohibition enacted before a majority of men are enlisted in its favor. The impression of female sentiment on the temperance question which one gathers in a Woman's Christian Temperance Union Convention is scarcely representative of the community at large. Foreign women, negro women, fashionable women, business women and thoughtless women must all be reckoned with. In general, wherever we find a man who sustains the saloon, directly or indirectly, we may be sure there is somewhere a woman—the female of his species—to match him. The principal reason which operates in the mind of good men to prevent their political action against the liquor traffic, is their attachment to some political party. While women do not vote they are largely free from this influence. When the suffrage was first conferred many women might join a new party in the interests of temperance, but as soon as women became fully enlisted in the race for office and the effort to "beat" their opponents, they would become as party-blind as the good deacons of the old parties to-day. There seems to be no reason to doubt that if women were placed in the same position in which men are, they would act as men do.

To the third question I have a more positive answer. Granting that Woman Suffrage is desirable in itself, and that it would assist the cause of temperance if secured, it is still certain that the Prohibition party ought not to advocate it.

The linking together of two great measures is sure to hinder the passage of both. This is capable of mathematical demonstration. Let there be 3,000 voters in a township. It is proposed to build a new bridge, and it is also proposed to build a new school-house. Naturally some who favor one of these measures will oppose the other. If the two measures are submitted together, so that a man cannot vote for one without also voting for the other, neither of them can be carried until there is a majority favorable to both. Yet each could be carried separately long before that time. There will be a time in the progress of discussion when 1,000 voters will favor the bridge and oppose the schoolhouse, another 1,000 will favor the schoolhouse and oppose the bridge, and the remaining 1,000 will favor both. Submit both propositions together and you are defeated by a two-thirds vote. Submit either of them separately and you win by a two-thirds vote. In such a case we should submit the two questions separately—not as a matter of policy but as a matter of principle. It is the only way in which the people can be enabled to express their true convictions. If an ardent advocate of the schoolhouse should say, "I will not allow these things to be separated; if anybody wants the bridge he has got to vote for the schoolhouse too," he would be guilty of a political immorality. This is what is commonly called a "rider"—one measure linked to another so that the person who desires the one must vote for the other against his will. This is the position which the Suffragists take in the Prohibition party to-day. They make suffrage a rider. They say, "The platform, the speakers, the machinery of the Prohibition party shall be used for suffrage also, so that no one can help the party without helping suffrage. If any man wants to help the Prohibition party he has got to help the cause of Woman Suffrage whether he believes in it or not."

This policy is particularly odious at a time when they are urging their fellow-citizens to drop all subordinate questions and unite upon the one issue of Prohibition. They ask the tariff men and the anti-tariff men to drop that question and attend to temperance. They exhort all other citizens to drop or defer their pet schemes for the sake of crushing the saloon, and yet insist upon lugging in their own hobby which is the greatest weight of all. They cannot claim to be working for suffrage in the interests of Prohibition because they cannot get suffrage until they already have a majority of men. This is the one sufficient reason for the twenty years' failure of the party. Like the Irishman's pig, "it is little, but it is old." The independent men who are ready to leave the old parties refuse to join a third party which insists upon violating their consciences by such a yoke as this. When the Suffrage plank was dropped in Ohio in 1885 the Prohibition vote rose from 11,000 to 28,000; but after four years of toil, with the suffrage millstone again upon its neck, the party cannot record a single foot of progress. The suspicion arises that the managers of the party do not expect to win voters and at last carry the country, but simply to carry on a miscellaneous agitation—playing at politics.

In conclusion, it is well to refer to the compromise of the Hon. John M. Olin, which was rejected under such remarkable circumstances at the Indianapolis Convention of 1888. He reminded the Suffragists that the question was purely a constitutional one, and that the only party action which is possible in the case is to submit a Constitutional Amendment. This the non-Suffragists, for the sake of peace, were willing to do. The compromise was rejected, and yet it remains true that if Woman Suffrage is ever secured it must be secured in this way. WILLIAM G. FROST.

Ether.—See CHLORAL.

Ethics of License.—We are not now concerned with the supposed merits of license as a repressive measure, whether or not it is better than "free whiskey" or practically more effective than legal Prohibition. We propose to ask whether in the court of pure ethics it can stand the test of moral law. It is, as has been alleged by very high authority, "vicious in principle." If so, the moral man will discard all its claims to recognition, no matter by what numbers urged or by what plausible arguments supported. His principle is not "Do evil that good may come." He will not choose to abate the consequences of one sin by committing another. In morals he will not listen to a proposition to choose the lesser of two evils. Between physical evils he may be glad to choose the lesser, but in morals he knows of no liberty to choose whether he shall offend God and his conscience and do evil to his neighbor by a greater or less sin. All talk to him about "a half loaf" as "better than no bread" sounds like the suggestion of the devil to make bread out of stones. He wants no half loaf tainted with death. His answer to all is, "The wages of sin is death." If he can believe that the liquor traffic "can never be legalized without sin," he wants no license, though it fill his coffers with money, though it reduce the number of saloons from thousands to units, and even if it should in any exceptional case show diminished arrests. He meets every proposition to license sin with the one unalterable imperative, "Thou shalt not."

But is the licensing of the saloon an evil always and everywhere? To get at a correct answer it is well to ask and answer several other questions:

1. What is the saloon?

The inquiry is not after some ideal institution possibly conducted in obedience to a very strict and technically exact license law, but the actual saloon as we have it and know it everywhere, that running sore on the body politic, that moral cancer on the conscience of the nation, that remorseless enemy of mankind which, according to Gladstone, hopelessly ruins more that is dear to humanity than the three curses of war, famine and pestilence. Shall we dignify such a curse as that into a legitimate industry by the solemn sanctions of law?

2. What is license?

Many who favor it, answer: "It is a tax which implies no endorsement and gives no sanction. It is rather a *stigma* upon a bad business. Its real object is to burden, cripple and limit a great and, at present, ineradicable evil." The object of moral reformers who advocate license is thus declared to be to impose such burdens on the accursed traffic as to destroy its profitableness, and thus to destroy the traffic. They can scarcely excuse the radical Prohibitionists for attempting the impossible and not at once falling in with them in what they claim to be the immediately effective and only practical method of destroying the drink curse. When met with the accusation of licensing sin, they reply that to call the tax on saloons a license is a misnomer. What, then, is a *tax?* What is a *license?* And wherein do they differ? A tax is a sum or levy imposed upon the members of society to defray its expenses. A government taxes its subjects when it demands money of them for its support. A license, on the contrary, is the granting of permission or authority to do what it would otherwise be unlawful to do. A tax requires something to be given—a license allows something to be done. A tax is for the community—a license is for the individual. A tax is a burden to be borne—a license is a privilege to be enjoyed. Moreover, the fee upon the licensed traffic constitutes a valid contract between the party issuing the license and the licensee, and makes both sharers in the gains and moral character of the business. This point was put with great force and justness by Hon. John Sherman of Ohio, in his celebrated speech in Columbus in 1882, on this very subject of taxing and licensing the liquor traffic: "I cannot see how you can have a tax law without its operating as a license law," said he; "a license is a legal grant; a tax on a trade or occupation implies a permission to follow that trade or occupation. We do not tax a crime. We prohibit and punish it. We do not share in the profits of a larceny; but by a tax we do share in the profits of liquor-selling, and therefore allow or license it."

The Senator's argument furnishes these three propositions: (1) The licensing of the traffic proceeds upon the theory that the business is not criminal, or ethically wrong, but legitimate and proper. (2) To tax the traffic is to license, protect and justify it. (3) To license it is to become a party to the business with all its social and moral consequences. This is done by the State. But what is the State? In a republic it is the aggregate citizenship. The act of the State licensing the liquor traffic is therefore the act of all who lend their influence and authority in favor of the legislation by which this is accomplished. This, again, is done by voting for and supporting men and parties that avow the principle of license. If the traffic is sinful then the legalizing of it is the same. Therefore those who frame this iniquity into a law, together with all who vote or petition or otherwise work for or approve it, are sinners in that degree.

This conclusion is so unwelcome and so contrary to popular thought that it will be contested from various points of view. Some will object to it because it omits the factor of necessity. "We must remember," it is said, "that society does not exist in an ideal state. Evil is here. We must confront and deal with it as a practical reality. We have to do not with a theory but a condition, and we must make the best of it. The tares are already among the wheat. We cannot root them out. Both must grow together till the harvest. All we can do is to watch that no more be sown, and by all proper devices seek to repress and limit the productiveness of those now here and thus suffer as few of the consequences as possible." This is plausible, but it is unsound and utterly vicious. Not only is the drink evil here, but all those other sins which are met by uncompromising Prohibition. The arguments made for licensing the liquor traffic have just as much fitness and force for the licensing of any other violation of God's law. Indeed, it has often been suggested that since the social evil is well-nigh universal and is fraught with untold consequences of evil, often to the innocent and unoffending, society ought to be protected as far as possible by some system of license and regulation. And if the saloon, why not the brothel?

Others object to our conclusion because it is said to leave out the fact that it is as much our duty to limit the evils which we cannot remove as to destroy those which we can. Otherwise we dare not do anything until we can do everything. Of 40 saloons it is better to destroy 20 than to leave the 40. That depends on what is done with the other 20. If the one-half are sacrificed only in such a way as to secure legal protection for the rest, then it is better to have the 40 unshielded than the 20 legalized. Forty mad-dogs on the streets are worse than 20. But it is better to let 40 take the chances of their necks, unprotected, than to have bands on the necks of 20, which say to the public, "Hands off! These mad-dogs are licensed." Will it be said that these are taxed to pay part of the damage done to the community for the privilege of spreading hydrophobia? Good men, neither drunk nor having hydrophobia, have been actually heard urging this plea for the saloon tax. The inevitable dilemma into which the advocates of license are brought is this: They must either defend the saloon against the charge that it is immoral, or confess that they are willing to license immorality. But most men who make any pretensions to morality—not to say decency—draw back from the first and blush to confess the second. And yet a very large number of those who have gone on record in conferences, synods, assemblies and otherwise, against the saloon as utterly vicious, and have loaded it down with their unsparing condemnation, are among the stanchest advocates of license. How is this? Consistency demands a change. They ought either to show that the saloon is not necessarily an evil, or refuse to license it.

JOEL SWARTZ.

Evangelical Adventist Church.—This denomination is represented nationally by the annual meeting of the American Millennial Association. J. E. Ballou, the Recording Secretary, writes: "The American Millennial Association has taken no action of late on the temperance or liquor question."

Evangelical Church.—For more than 60 years the Evangelical Association has had in its Discipline total abstinence and Prohibitory clauses. The last General Conference, held in Buffalo, N. Y., September, 1887, declared it to be the duty of Christians "To faithfully co-operate with all proper movements in the use of agencies and methods as their judgment and conscience may direct, having for their end the enlightenment of the public on the evils of intemperance, the instruction of the children and youth, the reformation of the inebriate and the restriction and Prohibition of the liquor traffic." The following declaration was added:

"Inasmuch as the use of tobacco and various preparations of opium has become lamentably prevalent, so that these, besides being in themselves injurious to health and a waste of money almost equal to that of the liquor traffic, are, by competent authority, declared to have the effect to awaken and foster desire for stimulants, and thereby to work in the interest of intemperance; we urge upon all, by all the considerations which witness against intemperance, to discountenance the habitual use of such, both by precept and example."

Excise.—A name originally applied to laws levying taxes on any species of home-made goods. In England Excise laws date from the 17th Century, when, under the Commonwealth, revenues were drawn from domestic products to defray the heavy expenses of the Government. The alcoholic liquor traffic was the chief source of the Excise revenue from the beginning, and gradually the Excise system became peculiarly and almost exclusively a system of liquor taxation. The term Excise duties in England is identical with the term Internal Revenue taxes in the United States, meaning duties laid and collected by the National Government; and in the same sense it is used in the British colonies. Very little of the liquor legislation in the United States is distinctively called Excise legislation; the terms license and tax take the place of the old English term Excise. Some State laws—notably the New York laws—are, however, popularly called Excise measures.

Exports.—See IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Farmers.—The anti-liquor movement has always been strongest in the rural sections. The farmers, compelled by circumstances to practice frugality and self-restraint in a sense unknown or known but imperfectly to laborers in the cities, readily grasp the strong points of the economic arguments against the saloon and manifest comparatively little favor for the plausible pro-saloon arguments that have so much weight with a very large element of the urban population. Living in isolated spots, often removed by miles from towns and hamlets, the farmers are not subject to the temptations that daily and nightly beset the occupants of city tenements; they do not regard the saloon as a club-house but as an institution which can be patronized by them, their sons or their laborers only at a great expense of time and money, and that works demoralization without yielding even the apparent advantage of social satisfaction.

REPRESENTATIVE UTTERANCES.

The organizations and newspapers[1] of the farmers oppose the liquor traffic with practical unanimity and great earnestness. Indeed, the farmers' organizations rank with the churches and the special temperance societies as supporters of the Prohibition cause. The representative associations of farmers in the United States are the National Farmers' Alliance and Laborers' Union, and the National Grange. The first-named, in convention at St. Louis, December, 1889, adopted a platform in which was the following plank:

"RESOLVED. That we are opposed to the liquor traffic in all its forms"

Previously to the St. Louis Convention, the National Farmers' Alliance and the Farmers' and Laborers' Union were two distinct organizations, the former having its chief strength in the North and the latter representing the agricultural classes of the South. The National Farmers' Alliance has been steadfast in opposition to the saloon. At a convention held at Des Moines, Ia., Jan. 11, 1889, it declared:

"RESOLVED, That we recommend the passage of such laws by the National Government as will prohibit the manufacture and sale of all intoxicating beverages within the borders of the United States under severe penalty."

And the convention of the National Farmers' Alliance for 1888 made the following utterance:

"RESOLVED, That we demand such legislation in regard to the liquor traffic as will prevent that business from increasing our taxes, endangering the morals of our children and destroying the usefulness of our citizens."

The National Grange exhibits equal antagonism to the liquor traffic. At its annual Convention for 1889, held at Sacramento, Cal. (Nov. 13), Master J. H. Brigham (head of the organization) said in his address:

"Every influence of our Order, financial and intellectual, fraternal and moral, is opposed to the traffic in intoxicating liquor Unsuccessful efforts have been made during the year to adopt Amendments prohibiting its manufacture and sale in several States. The failures of the year should teach us the great importance of concentrating the influence of those who are opposed to the traffic."

---

[1] Characteristic opinions from representative farmers' organs may be found in the *Voice* for May 1 and July 10, 1890.

The following are specimen declarations of State organizations of farmers:

Ohio State Farmers' Alliance, February, 1890: "*Whereas*, The traffic in intoxicating drink is now as it ever has been the eternal enemy of good government, the home and mankind; and

"*Whereas*, The farmers are largely the sufferers from the traffic on account of having the heavy burden of taxes to pay in prosecuting crime, and in maintaining jails, penitentiaries and poor-houses; and

"*Whereas*, No evil has ever been abolished by selling it the right to exist, and the saloon is a place that every decent citizen is ashamed to defend; therefore be it

"RESOLVED, By the Farmers' Alliance of the State of Ohio, that the liquor traffic is an enemy to the home, to society, to church and to State, and that the time has come when Christian people and all lovers of good government should cease to be indifferent and unite their efforts for the suppression of the evil."

Nebraska State Horticultural Society, at Lincoln, Jan. 16, 1890: "RESOLVED, That inasmuch as the State Legislature has submitted the question of license or Prohibition of the liquor traffic, to be settled at the next State election, and that arguments will be made claiming that Prohibition will be detrimental to the horticulturists, we therefore at this meeting of the Nebraska State Horticultural Society heartily endorse the principle of Prohibition and favor its adoption in the State Constitution as against license, without regard to party affiliations." [Unanimously adopted.]

Iowa State Grange, at Des Moines, Dec. 12, 1889: "RESOLVED, By this State Grange, that we are unalterably opposed to the traffic in alcoholic and intoxicating drinks as a beverage, and demand of the coming session of the State Legislature no receding from our present Prohibitory laws, but make them stronger for enforcing them in all parts of our noble State."

Colorado State Grange at Denver, Jan. 16, 1890: "*Whereas*, Over $1,000,000 000 is annually squandered in the drink traffic of our nation; and

"*Whereas*, It is the cause of seven-tenths of the crime and pauperism of our land; therefore, be it

"RESOLVED, That the Colorado State Grange, now assembled, declare in favor of the Prohibition of the liquor traffic, both in the State and nation."

RELATION TO PROHIBITION SUCCESSES.

With this strong sentiment prevailing among the farmers, it has naturally been easier to secure majorities for Prohibition in the rural districts than in the cities. A study of returns of Constitutional Prohibition and Local Option elections shows, with but few exceptions, an overwhelming preponderance of favorable sentiment in agricultural counties. For example, the memorable campaign for Constitutional Prohibition in Pennsylvania in 1889, though made under conditions remarkably disadvantageous to the Prohibitionists and resulting in an aggregate majority of 188,027 against Prohibition, would have been won by the Prohibitionists if the votes of eight counties containing large cities had been eliminated; the other 59 counties of the State (in which the agricultural element predominated) showed a Prohibition tendency strong enough to have given Prohibitory law to the whole of Pennsylvania if the vote of the eight leading urban counties had been equally divided for and against Prohibition. This rural sentiment has made Prohibition States of Maine, Kansas, Iowa, Vermont, New Hampshire, South Dakota and North Dakota, and has secured local Prohibition in more than 100 of the 137 counties of Georgia, in four-fifths of the country towns of Massachusetts, in nearly the whole of Tennessee, in a great number of the counties of whiskey-making Kentucky, etc. In rare instances the farmers have treated the Prohibition question with indifference or even with apparent hostility—notably in Texas, where the Prohibitory Amendment had a proportionately larger following in the cities than in the country, and in Oregon and Washington, where the balance of opinion among the farmers seemed to be against Constitutional Prohibition. But these results were due to special causes, and there is every reason to believe that a proper presentation of Prohibition arguments to the farmers under tolerably favorable conditions will invariably be followed by large Prohibition majorities.

THE FARMERS AND THE LIQUOR MANUFACTURERS.

Emphatic as is the general feeling of the agricultural masses against the saloon, their attitude would be much more aggressive were it not for the direct pecuniary interest that many of them have, or are persuaded they have, in the continuance of the manufacturing branches of the liquor traffic. The distillers, brewers and vintners must obtain their vegetable materials—their barley, rye, corn, hops, grapes, etc—from the farms. Several agricultural industries, especially the hop-growing, barley-growing and wine-grape-producing industries, are dependent almost entirely upon the manufacturers of alcoholic liquors. These manufacturers take pains to make it known to individual farmers that their patronage will be given only to persons opposed to Prohibition. Many farmers are thus made to believe that their prosperity is promoted by the liquor-makers' demand for their products.

But this is a fallacious belief. The articles of agricultural production that are essential to the liquor traffic are, generally speaking, no more profitable to the farmer than are crops raised for other purposes exclusively. Indeed, counted in the aggregate, the sums paid to the farmers by brewers, distillers, etc., constitute but an insignificant proportion of the value of farm produce. The following is a statistical demonstration:[1]

MATERIALS USED IN THE MANUFACTURE OF DISTILLED LIQUORS.

MATERIALS.		Average Price.	Amount used in production of spirituous liquors.	Value of materials used in making spirituous liquors.	Total production for the whole country.	Value of total production.
Corn..........	Bushels	$ .283	15,319,862	$4,335,520.94	2,112,892,000	$597,918,829.00
Rye..........	"	.457	3,259,917	1,489,782.07	28,415,000	12,985,655.00
[1]Malt........	"	.368	2,242,214	825,134.75	... .	....
Wheat........	"	.699	48,279	33,698.74	490,560,000	342,491,707.00
Oats....... ..	"	.23	23,632	5,435.36	751,515,000	171,781,008.00
Barley........	"	.427	21,589	9,218.50	63,884,000	27,278,468.00
[2]Mill-feed, etc.	"	.20	75,531	15,086.20	....	....
Bushels of grain...		....	20,991,024	$6,713,876.56	3,447,266,000	$1,152,455,667.00
[3]Molasses, gallons...		$ .46	1,951,104	897,507.34	21,980,000	10,110,800.00
Totals		....	....	$7,611,383.90	....	$1,162,566,467.00

[1] Malt, being made from other grain, is not set down in the total production for the whole country. The price given does not include malting, but is the price of the amount of barley required to make a bushel of malt, namely, 0.84 bushel.

[2] Mill-feed is also made from other grain. Since it is largely refuse, the price taken is one-half the average of all other kinds of grain. The 1,842 bushels of "other materials" reported by the Internal Revenue Department as used in the production of spirituous liquors are included with mill-feed.

[3] The figures for the total product.on of molasses for the whole country are for 1888, as those for 1889 are not at hand. The price given is the average for the year in the New York market.

In the above table the quantities of materials used in the manufacture of liquors are taken from the report of the Internal Revenue Department for the year ending June 30, 1889. Comparison is made with the total quantities, average prices and total values for the whole country of the same materials—except molasses, —as furnished to Hon. Roger Q. Mills by the statistician of the Agricultural Department, and quoted by Mr. Mills on page 4,552 of the *Congressional Record* [1890].

MATERIALS USED IN THE MANUFACTURE OF MALT LIQUORS.

The Internal Revenue Department is careful not to give the quantities of materials used in the manufacture of malt liquors, as it does of those used in the production of distilled liquors. It is necessary therefore to make independent estimates.

The chief ingredients of honest beer are malt and hops. It is agreed by all authorities that not more than two bushels of malt goes to a barrel of ordinary beer. The average weight of a brewer's bushel of malt is not in excess of 38 lbs. On the basis of these figures the malt consumed in producing the 25,119 853 barrels of beer manufactured in the United States in 1889, and the total sum paid by the brewers for the malt, would be:

Malt 50,239,706 bushels at 36.8c. per bushel (see table above)=$18,487,214.81.

It is not so easy to estimate the quantity of hops Practical brewers, when confidentially consulted, will generally admit that not less than 2 lbs. of hops should go to a barrel. Dr. Francis Wyatt, Director of the National Brewers' Academy in New York in a statement to a reporter for the *Voice*, said that 2 lbs. is the average quantity required to produce a barrel of good beer.[2] This is a very moderate estimate compared with the ones made in authoritative essays on brewing. For example, the author of the "Encyclopædia Brittanica" article, "Brewing" (S. A. Wyllie, himself a prominent and experienced brewer), says:

> "For strong store ales from 10 lbs. to 13 lbs. of good hops to every quarter of malt is not too much; whilst for ordinary beers, to be drunk within two months, from 6 lbs. to 9 lbs. per quarter should suffice. India pale ale and bitter beer require from 18 lbs. to 25 lbs. per quarter."

And in the article on "Brewing" in the "Globe Encyclopædia," the following statement is made:

> "For each quarter of malt 4½ lbs. of hops are required in ordinary beer; for superior ales 8 lbs. are employed, and as high as from 14 lbs. to 20 lbs. for export beer."

Since four "quarters" of malt go to a barrel, the reader will readily see that the estimate of 2 lbs. of hops per barrel is very much beneath the quantity specified by writers on ideal encyclopædia beer. The great difference illustrates the extensive character of the adulterations practised in the brewing "industry."

But even assuming that 2 lbs. per barrel is the requisite proportion, the total quantity of hops available in the United States falls far short of supplying an average of 2 lbs. for each barrel of beer manufactured. In 1880 there were 13,347,110 barrels of beer produced, requiring (on the above basis) 26,694,220 lbs. of hops. The entire hop crop of that year was 26,546,378 lbs, to which add 497,243 lbs. imported, giving a total of 26,953,621 lbs., from which subtract 9,001 128 lbs. exported, leaving a total of 17 952,493 lbs. of hops available in that year as against 26,694,220 lbs. needed to produce 13,347,110 barrels of beer on the basis of 2 lbs. of hops to the barrel.

---

[1] For the largest part of this demonstration we are indebted to the *Voice* for May 29, 1890, although we have eliminated or changed certain features of the *Voice's* estimates.

[2] The *Voice*, May 9, 1889, and Aug. 14, 1890.

Therefore the quantity actually used is far below the amount legitimately needed; and the proof of this truth deserves the attention of those farmers who are accustomed to regard liquor manufacturers as among their liberal patrons.

Coming now to determine the amount of hops of American production at present bought annually by the brewers, we find that there are no official statistics of the hop crop of 1889; but it is estimated on reputable authority at 36,000,000 lbs.[1] On the same authority the average price per pound in 1889 is put at 18 to 18¾ cents. Reckoning the average price at 18⅛ cents, the total cost would be

Hops, 36,000,000 lbs. at 18⅛c.=$6,360,000.

This is certainly a very liberal valuation; the report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for 1887 gives only $3 500,000 as the total value of hops grown in 1886.

MATERIALS USED IN THE MANUFACTURE OF VINOUS LIQUORS.

There are no official figures from which the total sum paid to farmers by wine-makers can be accurately computed. The annual wine product of the United States is about 30,000,000 gallons, valued (to the consumer) at about $2 per gallon; but the value of domestic wines at first hand is put by the Commissioner of Agriculture in his report for 1887 at only $10,000.000. By far the largest proportion of the wine-grape product is raised under the immediate auspices of the wine-makers; and besides, the 30,000,000 gallons stands for extensive adulterations. If $2,500,000 is indicated as the sum paid annually by wine-manufacturers to persons who may legitimately be classed with the farming element, the estimate will probably be so much in excess of the actual amount as to include not merely the value of grapes but the values of apples, pears, berries and all other agricultural products used in the manufacture of liquors not accounted for above.

SUMMARY.

The table printed below. summarizing quantities and values. shows that the liquor manufacturers pay to the farmers less than 3 per cent. of the total value of the materials named. But grain, molasses, hops, grapes, etc., constitute only a portion of the agricultural produce. The aggregate value of the entire output of the agricultural interests of the United States is now about $4.500,000 000 annually;[2] so that the aggregate amount paid by liquor manufacturers for farm products in 1889 ($35 000,000 in round numbers) was less than seven and eight-tenths one-thousandths (.0078) of the whole value of the goods that the farmers had to dispose of in that year. In other words, if the annual income of the average farmer be $500, only $3.90 of this income is derived from the liquor manufacturers, making the most generous possible allowances; and this $3.90 represents total receipts, not profits.

MATERIALS.	Total quantity produced.	Value.	Quantity used by liquor-makers.	Value.
Grain ....Bushels	3,447,266,000	$1,152,455,667.00	71,230,690	$25,201,088.37
Molasses......Gallons	21,980,241	10,110,910.86	1,951,104	897,507.84
Hops..........Pounds	36,000,000	6,360,000.00	36,000,000	6,360,000.00
Grapes and all other..	....	....	....	2,500,000.00
Totals		$1,168,926,577.86 [1]		$34,958,596.21

[1] Not including grapes, apples, etc.

PROFIT AND LOSS.

The immediate and complete destruction of every manufacturing branch of the liquor traffic would in the aggregate, therefore, not perceptibly diminish the value of farm products, even temporarily. No permanent injury worth considering could be effected, for land devoted to the cultivation of barley, hops, wine-grapes, etc., can at any time be advantageously put to other uses.

On the other hand, the farmer bears his full share of the losses to society occasioned by the liquor traffic. The direct cost represented by the actual cash expenditures for alcoholic drink is estimated by no one to be less now than $800,000,000 per annum[3] in the United

---

[1] "Tariff Reform" documents (New York), vol. 3, No. 7.

[2] Computed from the reports of the Department of Agriculture.

[3] See footnote, p. 138.

States; and probably it is nearer $1,000,000,000 per annum than this figure. (See COST OF THE DRINK TRAFFIC.) The indirect cost, occasioned by expenditures on account of taxes, crime, pauperism, etc., due to the drink traffic, and by loss of time, health, wages, etc., is believed by every careful student of the subject to be fully as great as the direct cost. Therefore the entire direct and indirect cost to the people of the United States because of the existence of this traffic ranges from $1,600,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 or more per annum. In 1880 (according to the Census) more than 40 per cent. of all persons engaged in gainful occupations were connected with agricultural pursuits. It cannot be safely assumed that 40 per cent. of the cost of the drink traffic is therefore borne by the farmers, for the farmers are certainly more temperate than most other classes. But most people will admit that if it is estimated that not less than 20 per cent. of this cost falls directly or indirectly upon the farmers, the estimate will be low. Twenty per cent. of $1,600,000,000 (the lowest possible estimate of the aggregate direct and indirect cost of the liquor traffic per annum) is $320,000,000—the farmers' share (on the basis of an extremely conservative calculation) of the annual expenditure in the United States for supporting a traffic which, at the utmost, pays the farmers but $35,000,000 for the grain, hops, molasses, grapes, etc., consumed in its manufacturing branches. On the basis of this exceedingly conservative estimate the farmer pays more than $9 to support the drink traffic for every dollar that he receives from it; and when it is considered that the $9 paid out is clear loss for which absolutely nothing of value comes back, while the dollar received is not clear gain but represents simply the sum paid by the liquor manufacturers in exchange for the farmers' commodities and labor—when also fair allowance is made for the too conservative methods of calculation that we have employed, it will readily be granted that the farmer's profit and loss in his account with the liquor traffic may more reasonably be supposed to stand in the ratio of $1 to $20 than $1 to $9.

But this is not all. The extinction of the whole liquor business would indisputably benefit every legitimate producing interest. The $800,000,000 or $1,000,000,000 now expended directly each year in the United States for intoxicating drink would then be applied to other purposes. Of course a very large proportion of it would be hoarded by individuals, deposited in savings-banks, etc.; but a great proportion would be used for buying necessaries of life for the poverty-stricken families of drinkers. However large this proportion would be—whether one-half, two-thirds or a larger or smaller percentage of the entire $800,000,000 or $1,000,000,000 now wasted for liquor,—immense sums would necessarily be added to those now expended for the farmer's products. Besides enabling the farmer to save what he is now forced to spend for the support of the liquor traffic and its criminals, paupers, Courts, jails, etc., Prohibition would increase the market for his goods and swell his receipts.

Fermentation.—The chemical phenomenon presented by the so-called spontaneous decomposition of organic matter. Any organic substance, acted on by water, air and warmth—especially when macerated so as to facilitate the decay of its particles—soon begins to bubble or effervesce; its chemical composition changes, gas escapes and new substances are formed. There are several stages and varieties of fermentation: the sacharine, by which starch is converted into sugar; the vinous, changing sugar into alcohol; the acetic, transforming alcohol into acetic acid or vinegar, and the putrefactive, converting nitrogenous organic matter into putrid substances. A strictly scientific discussion of fermentation, its complex chemical aspects and the various theories advanced by different investigators, does not fall within the scope of this work.

Vinous fermentation is the representative stage. Any newly-extracted fruit juice—as of grapes, apples, pears, etc.—will, if left exposed to the air, gradually begin to ferment. Bubbles appear on the surface, caused by the generation of carbonic acid gas. The escape of this gas is accompanied by the accumulation of a scum or yeast, which increases while the ebullition in the liquid becomes more active. When finally the ebullition ceases the work of vinous fermentation is completed, the yeast is deposited at the bottom and the liquid has lost its sweetish taste and innocuous qualities and becomes an alcoholic and intoxicating liquor. The change is due to the conversion of the grape-sugar of the fresh juice, by chemical action, into carbonic acid gas and alcohol. This change is indicated with substantial correctness by the following formula:

$$\underset{\textit{Grape-sugar.}}{C_6H_{12}O_6} = \underset{\textit{Carbonic Acid.}}{2\,CO_2} + \underset{\textit{Alcohol.}}{2\,C_2H_6O.}$$

The decomposition of the grape-sugar into these elements is brought about by the chemical action of the yeast slowly generated in the natural process of fermentation; hence if a quantity of yeast be thrown into the fermenting liquor the fermentation will be greatly accelerated. To produce the vinous fermentation and obtain an alcoholic decoction, it is necessary that the substance to be fermented shall (1) contain a sufficient percentage of grape-sugar; (2) shall contain water to dissolve the grape-sugar; (3) shall be under a temperature not too low or too high to arrest fermentation—preferably a temperature of from 68° to 75° F.; (4) shall be capable of generating a sufficient quantity of yeast, and (5) shall be exposed to the air. Substances weak in sugar or in constituents capable of conversion into sugar yield but little alcohol. Cereals containing large percentages of starch, by special treatment become rich in sugar, the starch being transformed into grape-sugar by a species of fermentation; and thus cereals are equally available with fruits for the production of intoxicating liquors – in fact are used to a much greater extent, because their cultivation on a large scale is comparatively easier and because the beverages made from them are relatively cheaper.

Since the oxygen of the air is an indispensable element of successful vinous fermentation, freshly-expressed juices can be preserved in the unfermented form by placing them in carefully sealed vessels. The sealing process is essential to the preservation of "unfermented wine." The successful preservation of canned fruits is due to the same circumstance—the exclusion of the air.

After the completion of the vinous fermentation the alcoholic product is guarded against further chemical change by storing it in closed barrels, bottles, etc., to which the air does not have access. Continued exposure of wine, cider, etc., to the air would gradually cause its conversion, under the influence of another fermentation, into vinegar. This is true, however, of fermented liquors only: being comparatively weak in alcohol they are readily oxidized. A wine, no matter how fine, or a beer, however carefully prepared, will become sour, flat and wholly unpalatable if left unsealed for any considerable length of time. Distilled spirits, however, being strong in alcohol are not easily changed by oxygen, although under certain processes (with suitable conditions of temperature) pure alcohol can be oxidized into vinegar, and in practice much of the vinegar of commerce is made from alcohol direct.

Fermented Liquors.—See MALT LIQUORS and VINOUS LIQUORS.

Finch, John Bird.—Born in Lincklaen, N. Y., March 17, 1852, and died in Boston, Mass., Oct. 3, 1887. Owing to poor health he did not attend school until ten years of age. He taught for several years and was at one time principal of Union School at Smyrna, N. Y. In 1871, at the age of 19, he was married to Retta Coy, who died four years later, Feb. 20, 1875. In May, 1876, he married Frances E. Manchester. He studied law and was admitted to practice at the bar at the age of 24. When 15 years old he joined the Good Templars, and early in life he was made Grand Lodge Lecturer for the State of New York. In 1877 he removed to Lincoln, Neb., and lectured in the interests of the Red Ribbon movement, securing 100,000 signers of the pledge in 12 months. In the fall of 1878 he gave 62 successive lectures in Omaha, 14,000 persons signing the pledge and six Good Templar Lodges, three Red Ribbon Clubs and one Temple of Honor being formed. He also addressed the Nebraska Legislature in compliance with a joint resolution passed by both Houses. In 1878 he was elected Grand Worthy Counselor of the Nebraska Grand Lodge by the Good Templars, and the next year was made Grand Worthy Chief Templar of that State. In 1884 he was elected Right Worthy Grand Templar of the Order in the United States, and he set to work to reunite the two factions into which it had split in 1876. In May, 1887, after three years of ceaseless labor, he saw this union accomplished at a convention at Saratoga, N. Y. Originally a Democrat, Mr. Finch, in 1880, united with the Prohibition party; and he became one of its most active champions and beyond comparison its ablest and most judicious leader. In 1884 he was elected Chairman of the National Prohibition Committee; and despite his frequently-expressed desire to retire he retained that position until his death. On the night of Oct. 3, 1887, he made a speech at Lynn, Mass., and afterward took the train to Boston, 11 miles distant. As he stepped from the car to the platform in the Boston depot, he dropped dead from heart disease.

Mr. Finch's addresses were remarkable for eloquence and force. His debate with Dio Lewis on "Prohibition," and his masterly reply to D. Bethune Duffield at Detroit, are among the best. His book, "The People v. the Liquor Traffic" (New York, 1887), embraces several of these addresses, and is numbered among the standard works on the question of Prohibition. As a platform speaker he possessed superb powers, and the undivided judgment of competent observers pronounced him by far the greatest of all political Prohibition orators, in the same sense that Gough was the greatest of moral suasion advocates. He had a remarkably handsome face, strong but kind; a noble bearing, a very generous and magnanimous disposition and an unflinching will. His executive capacity was of a high order, and his plans for promoting the interests that he had in charge seldom or never failed —at all events were never seriously opposed by his associates. Yet he carried his projects by tact and not by force. Though an unbending champion of the most radical Prohibition policy, he recognized the importance of educational work, and through all the exciting Prohibition campaigns he consistently performed his duty as the head of the Good Templar Order. Like many extreme Prohibitionists he did not at first foresee the dangers that would result from encouraging High License and other compromise legislation. He was one of the framers of the Nebraska High License law and did as much as any man to place it on the statute-books. Yet he was quick to admit its utter failure as a temperance act, and he repudiated the High License idea entirely. He steadily refused to become a candidate for office. There is no doubt that his untimely death was due to excessive labor in the Prohibition movement: though he had been warned repeatedly by his physicians and had suffered from alarming attacks of heart disease, he could not be persuaded to abate his energies. The news of his death stunned the temperance public, and the greatest grief was manifested throughout the country. His widow, with the co-operation of his co-laborer, Frank J. Sibley, has published an interesting and valuable history of his career. ("John B. Finch," New York, 1888.)

Fisk, Clinton Bowen, fifth candidate of the Prohibition party for President of the United States; born in Griggsville, Livingston County, N. Y., Dec. 8, 1828, and died in New York, July 9, 1890. His father, a blacksmith, removed to Michigan in 1830, believing that his five sons, of whom Clinton was the youngest, would have a better chance in life in the newer country. But two years after the removal he died, and each son as he became old enough was put out to earn his own living. At the age of nine, Clinton was bound to a farmer to serve until 21, his recompense to be a horse, a saddle, a bridle, two suits of clothes, $200 and three months' schooling each year. After a few years of service his release was procured and the next ten years were spent in hard work and study. He mastered considerable Latin unaided. When he was 13 his mother married again, but just as preparations had been made to send him to Wesleyan Seminary, at Albion, Mich., his step-father died. He removed with his mother to Albion and studied and taught until his eye-sight failed him, and he was obliged to give up further thoughts of education. He began business life with L. D. Crippen, the leading merchant and banker of Coldwater, Mich., and in 1850 was married to Mr. Crippen's daughter. In the financial crises of 1857 Mr. Fisk lost most of his property because of his determination that his bank should pay dollar for dollar instead of suspending. In 1858 he removed to St. Louis, Mo., and became Western Financial Agent of the Etna Insurance Company. At the outbreak of the Civil War he enlisted as a private soldier for three months. When the St. Louis Merchants' Exchange seemed likely to exert its influence for the Confederacy he organized a rival Exchange, the Union Merchants' Exchange, which soon swallowed up the old organization. In July, 1862, he set about recruiting a regiment, which was soon at the front. Later, he organized a brigade, and on Nov. 24, 1862, he was commissioned Brigadier-General. He was for some months in command of South-east Missouri and afterward of the district of St. Louis. With a small force he repelled the attack made upon Jefferson City by Marmaduke and Shelby, and made them prisoners. In February, 1865, he was commissioned Major-General of the Missouri militia, and a month later was made Major-General by brevet, "for faithful and meritorious services during the war." From May, 1865, until September, 1866, he was Assistant-Commissioner of the Freedmen's Bureau, and was in charge of Kentucky, Tennessee and parts of Alabama, Arkansas and Mississippi. The Fisk University for colored youth was founded at Nashville, Tenn., largely through his instrumentality. Since his resignation from the army in the fall of 1866 he was engaged until his death in railroad management and the banking business. He was for eight years Treasurer of the Missouri and Pacific Railroad Company. A Republican in politics up to 1884, Gen. Fisk that year gave his support to ex-Governor St. John, the Presidential candidate of the Prohibition party. In 1886 he was the candidate of the Prohibition party for Governor of New Jersey. During the campaign he made 125 speeches, traveling 5,000 miles, and never missed an engagement. He received 19,808 votes, three times as many as had been polled by St. John in New Jersey in 1884. On May 30, 1888, he was nominated for President of the United States by the Prohibition Convention at Indianapolis. His personal popularity, high character and recognized ability contributed materially to the strength of the party. His feeble health prevented him from taking a very active part in the canvass, but he made a few speeches. His aggregate vote in the nation reached 249,945. After the election he exhibited undiminished interest in the Prohibition cause. He was one of the most generous contributors to the movement, made numerous speeches in Constitutional Prohibition and Local Option campaigns, and heartily supported Gospel temperance and similar work. He was active and prominent in other good causes. As a youth and young man he was a devoted Abolitionist, and played a part in "Underground Railroad" enterprises. He was appointed by President Grant a member of the Board of Indian Commissioners and was immediately elected President of the Board; and he held the position until his death. He was the most prominent lay member of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. In 1874 he was chosen delegate to the General Conference at Louisville, Ky., where, for the first time since the Civil War, the Northern and Southern branches of the church exchanged greetings. He became a member of the Methodist Book Committee in 1876 and in 1881 was appointed delegate to the Ecumenical Council in London. He delivered the address on missions before the Centennial Methodist Assemblage in Baltimore in 1884. He was also a member of the Board of Managers of the American Missionary Association, and was identified with a large number of local religious, educational and charitable interests.

Fisk, Wilbur.—Born in Brattleboro, Vt., Aug. 31, 1792, and died in Middletown, Conn., Feb. 22, 1839. Graduating from Brown University in 1815 he studied law, but afterwards abandoned it for the Christian ministry. In 1825 he was chosen the first principal of Wilbraham Academy, at Wilbraham, Mass , and in 1830 was elected the first President of Wesleyan University. In the agitation for freeing the Methodist Episcopal Church from all complicity with the liquor traffic and from all fellowship with liquor-traffickers, he took a very radical stand, and in consequence encountered strong opposition and even misrepresentation and persecution. The *Christian Advocate* at first antagonized him, but afterwards changed its attitude. The fear of the over-cautious was that if uncompromising hostility to the liquor trade were made a test of church membership, there would be a split in the denomination, but Dr. Fisk did not permit such a possibility to restrain him. To a member of the church who sought to dissuade him from making a radical temperance address, he replied: "Sir, if the church stands on rum, let it go."

The following is an extract from a speech made by him in 1832:

> "My Christian brother, if you saw this trade as I believe God sees it, you would sooner beg your bread from door to door than gain money by such a traffic. The Christian's dramshop! Sound it to yourself. How does it strike your ear? It is doubtless a choice gem in the phrase-book of Satan! But how paradoxical! How shocking to the ear of the Christian! How offensive to the ear of deity! Why, the dramshop is the recruiting rendezvous of hell! And shall a Christian consent to be the recruiting officer? . . . Say not, if you do not sell, others will. Must you be an ally of Satan and a destroyer of your race because others are? Say not, if you do not sell, it will injure your business and prevent your supporting your family. It was said by one that 'such a statement is a libel upon the divine government.' Must you, indeed, deal out ruin to your fellowmen, or starve? Then starve! It would be a glorious martyrdom contrasted with the other alternative. . . . The church must free herself from this whole business. It is all a sinful work, with which Christians should have nothing to do, only to drive it from the sacred enclosures of the church, and, if possible, from the earth."

Florida.—See Index.

Flournoy, Josiah.—Born in Virginia in 1790, and died in 1842. He removed to Georgia when young, and was so successful in business pursuits that he became the owner of a large plantation near Eatontown. As a temperance leader he is remembered for his connection with the Georgia agitation of 1839 known as the Flournoy Movement, whose object was to secure the abolition by the State Legislature of the liquor license laws. In the spring of 1839 a meeting of citizens of Putnam County, Ga., through a committee of which Mr. Flournoy was a member, issued an address to the people of Georgia, published in the Atlanta *Christian Index* for March 21, 1839, asking whether the evil of the legalized liquor traffic "ought not to be exterminated." A petition to the State Legislature was published in the *Index* in March of the same year, signed by about 300 citizens of the county. It contained the following words:

> "The undersigned, citizens of this State, believing that the retail of spirituous liquors is an evil of great magnitude among us, come to the Legislature by petition and ask you, in your wisdom, to pass such a law as will effectually put a stop to it. . . . Your petitioners come with the more confidence because several States in this Union have already passed such a law as to make penal the retailing of intoxicating drinks."

Mr. Flournoy canvassed the State for signatures to the petition, visiting nearly every part of the commonwealth. His example aroused the people and public meetings were called everywhere. When it became apparent from the indifference of the politicians that the Legislature would probably disregard the petition, some of the petitioners began to nominate independent legislative candidates. The political aspect which the movement now took on commanded the attention of partisan leaders and newspapers, and in the contest for Governor, which was decided by a majority of only a few hundreds, party spirit ran high. Shortly before the election the success of the petitioners seemed certain, but the politicians appealed to prejudice by declaring that party interests were endangered, and the popular movement was checked. The Legislature refused to act. Mr. Flournoy's death, which occurred soon after, was attributed to disappointment at the defeat of the cause. This was one of the first agitations conducted on political lines. The encouraging and discouraging conditions were thus alluded to by Mr. Flournoy:

> "I have addressed thousands in public meetings, and spoken to hundreds in private. I find the number of those who favor the plan of a law to banish the tippling-shops from the land to be as eight or nine in ten. No proposition can be offered to the citizens of Georgia that will meet with the same unanimity, nor any ten combined can produce the same good. I have just returned from a trip of ten days to the South. In one of the lower counties I believe every man would sign our petition, and nowhere, even among the worst drunkards, do I meet with opposition. I find more difficulty with men who call themselves politicians than any others; as a class they are least to be expected to do anything to promote the morality of the country. With a few exceptions, they seem desirous to keep back all that would elevate the great mass of society, I suppose, for fear they will lose their own importance. I freely warn them that the man who opposes this law, and knows what he is doing at the same time, will deserve and receive the anathemas of the country. He is one who for his own honor's exaltation could drink the tears of

female suffering and eat the bread of starving children."

Food.—Is alcohol a food? The question is touched upon by Dr. B. W. Richardson in his able article in this work. (See ALCOHOL, EFFECTS OF.) The subject is very thoroughly discussed in his celebrated "Ten Lectures on Alcohol" (New York, 1883, pp. 94–122). The fundamental considerations which must precede any inquiry are thus admirably outlined by him (pp. 95–7):

"The earth yields spontaneously to man, either from herself directly or from the vegetable kingdom which lies between her and man, all the requirements for his existence. Whatever, therefore, man invents, though it may seem to be a great necessity, is not a necessity except to those who, being trained to its use, have been led artificially to believe it essential. Thus nature has produced water and milk for man to drink, and they are, in truth, all the fluids that are essential. This lesson, which nature treats by her rule of provision for the necessities of animal life, is supplemented by many other facts, each equally authoritative. There is ever before us the great experiment that all classes of living beings beneath man require as drink none other fluids except those I have named. We see the most useful of these animals performing laborious tasks, undergoing extremes of fatigue, bearing vicissitudes of heat and of cold, and enduring work, fatigue and vicissitudes for long series of years, sustained by their solid food with no other fluid than simple water. We see again whole nations and races of men who labor hard, endure fatigue and exposure, and who live to the end of a long and healthy life, taking with their solid sustenance water only as a beverage

"When we turn to the physiological construction of man or of a lower animal, we discover nothing that can lead us to conceive the necessity for any other fluid than that which nature has supplied. The mass of the blood is composed of water, the mass of the nervous system is composed of water, the mass of all the active vital organs is made up of the same fluid: the secretions are watery fluids, and if in any of these parts any other agent than water should replace it the result is an instant disturbance of function that is injurious in proportion to the displacement.

"When we turn therefore to the use of such a fluid as alcohol under any of its disguises—as spirit, as wine, as beer, as cider, as perry, as liqueur—we are driven *a priori* to look upon it as something superadded to the necessities of life, to look upon it, in a word, as a luxury. In such sense it has always been received amongst those nations which have most indulged in it. It is something added to the ordinary life, something unnecessary but agreeable. Wine, added to the meal, transforms the meal into a feast; it is supposed to make glad the heart, but it is never supposed that if the wine were not possessed the life would be shortened. When now we offer wine it is, by the effect of habit and education, an offering of a thing that is super-necessitous and in such wise a compliment, an indication of a desire or of willingness to be exceedingly hospitable.

"All the evidence of a general kind which can be gathered from these observations points to the uselessness, for man, of such an artificial agent as alcohol."

The main conclusion drawn from these general truths is no longer very seriously questioned among scientists. The claim is still championed that alcohol has some food value, but always cautiously and with material qualifications. Dr. William A. Hammond, as the result of experiments performed upon himself, says: "There are two facts which cannot be laid aside, and these are that the body gained in weight and that the excretions were diminished when alcoholic fluids were taken. These phenomena were doubtless due to the following causes: (1) the restoration of the decay of the tissues; (2) the diminution in the consumption of fat in the body, and (3) the increase of the assimilative powers of the system, by which the food was more completely appropriated and applied to the formation of tissues. After such results are we not justified in regarding alcohol as food? If it is not food, what is it?"[1] Dr. Hammond's testimony that alcohol in a single case under certain conditions increased the weight of the body, of course has no decisive bearing; and even if it did have, it might be questioned whether the increased weight were not due to deleterious rather than beneficial action of the alcohol in arresting the legitimate decomposition of tissue. It is generally recognized by physicians that the apparently florid health of beer-drinkers is misleading. "The beer-drinker," says Dr. T. Lauder Brunton ("Book of Health," London, 1883), "has a tendency to become fat and bloated at one time, although he may afterwards become thin and emaciated, from his digestion also suffering like that of the spirit-drinker. Notwithstanding the apparent stoutness and strength of beer-drinkers, they are by no means healthy. Injuries which to other people would be but slight, are apt to prove serious in them; and when it is necessary to perform surgical operations upon them the risk of death is very much greater than in others."

---

[1] Address before the New York Neurological Society, 1874.

Among the most emphatic opinions concerning the nutritive properties of alcohol, that of the great German chemist Liebig is justly celebrated. "If a man drinks daily eight or ten quarts of the best Bavarian beer," said he, "in the course of 12 months he will have taken into his system the nutritive constituents contained in a five-pound loaf of bread." And again Liebig said: "Wine is quite superfluous to man. . . . It is constantly followed by expenditure of power." Yet Liebig was the originator of the theory that alcohol yields heat and force, and is therefore a respiratory food—a theory that has been the ground for much contention, out of which have been developed various other theories supporting the general claim that alcohol, in some way and to some extent (however limited), performs the part of a food, if only accessorily.

These battles of the scientists, however, relate to theory far more than to practice. Even those who cling most tenaciously to earlier doctrines declare that the virtues which they still claim for alcohol are virtues only under certain carefully-guarded conditions. No reputable scientific writer ventures at this day to commend alcohol as a food with the confidence and positiveness exhibited when the belief in its powers was universal. The commendation is now defensive and not aggressive. The practical experience of mankind demonstrates with constantly increasing impressiveness the negative of the food proposition. Whenever great feats of endurance, skill, resistance to cold or heat, etc., are to be performed—as in pedestrian matches, billiard contests, Arctic voyages, labor in the tropics, etc.,—total abstinence from alcohol is found to promote success. Could this be the case if alcohol were a legitimate contributor to the better capabilities of the human body? With the verdict wholly made up against alcohol as a necessary agent for improving the welfare of the physical nature, the cautious defensive pleas against utter and indiscriminate condemnation of alcohol on physiological grounds are more and more regarded as belonging peculiarly to the domain of hypothetical discussion.

Understanding, then, that the testimony of science sanctions (if it does not yet with undivided voice command) the entire abandonment of alcohol as an article of diet, the moral and other powerful reasons against indulgence in alcohol certainly urge with great strength the view that its toleration as a supposed food or food-adjunct has become altogether inadmissible. The acceptance of this view involves the responsibility of discountenancing by every means the use of alcohol for all the numerous pseudo-food purposes to which it is still applied by the credulity of the masses—especially of combating the fallacy (so widespread among the poor) that it gives strength to nursing mothers, of discouraging resort to it as a protection against cold, and of entirely banishing it from the domestic economy as a culinary agent.

Foreigners.—The foreign-born population of the United States has been regarded as the bulwark of the opposition to temperance reform and Prohibition. Well-nigh all the adopted citizens of this country come from nations where drink and the drink traffic are in no important respects discriminated against by public sentiment, by widespread organizations or by legislation. The masses of these people have acquired but little education, have no adequate perception of the unmitigated evil of drink, and are exceedingly jealous of their personal rights, real and supposed. Becoming residents and naturalized citizens of a country where the temperance reform is carried on with zeal and radicalism, they are not willing converts to a movement whose rationale is unfamiliar to them. It is natural for the large majority of them to support the liquor traffic when its right to exist is questioned; and this natural disposition is strengthened by the counsels and influence of the newspapers printed in their native tongues and of such of their compatriots as have mastered the practical methods of American politics.

There are no official records of the numbers of immigrants arriving in the United States previously to 1820. The following table shows the yearly immigration from 1820 to 1889:

YEAR ENDING SEPT. 30,	IMMIGRANTS.	YEAR ENDING SEPT. 30.	IMMIGRANTS.
1820	8,385	1826	10,837
1821	9,127	1827	18,875
1822	6,911	1828	27,382
1823	6,354	1829	22,520
1824	7,912	1830	23,322
1825	10,199	1831	22,633

YEAR ENDING SEPT. 30.	IMMIGRANTS.	YEAR ENDING SEPT. 30,	IMMIGRANTS.
1832[1]	60,482	1861	89,724
1833	58,640	1862	89,007
1834	65,365	1863	174,524
1835	45,374	1864	193,195
1836	76,242	1865	247,453
1837	79,340	1866[5]	163,594
1838	38,914	1867	298,967
1839	68,069	1868	282,189
1840	84,066	1869	352,569
1841	80,289	1870	387,203
1842	104,565	1871	321,350
1843[2]	52,496	1872	404,806
1844	78,615	1873	459,803
1845	114,371	1874	313,339
1846	154,416	1875	227,498
1847	234,968	1876	169,986
1848	226,527	1877	141,857
1849	297,024	1878	138,469
1850[3]	369,980	1879	177,826
1851	379,466	1880	457,257
1852	371,603	1881	669,431
1853	368,645	1882	788,992
1854	427,833	1883	603,322
1855[4]	200,877	1884	518,592
1856	195,857	1885	395,346
1857	246,945	1886	334,203
1858	119,501	1887	490,109
1859	118,616	1888	546,889
1860	150,237	1889	444,427

[1] For 15 months ending Dec. 31, 1832.

[2] For 9 months ending Sept. 30, 1843.

[3] For 15 months ending Dec. 31, 1850.

[4] Figures from 1820 to 1855 inclusive, are for all foreign passengers (including visitors, etc.) arrived in the United States; figures from 1856 to 1889 are for immigrants only.

[5] For six months ending June 30, 1866.

The Census tables for 1880 show that the foreign-born inhabitants of the United States in that year were contributed by different countries in the numbers indicated below:

Germany	1,966,742	Russia	35,722
Ireland	1,854,571	Belgium	15,585
British America	717,084	Luxemborg	12,836
England	662,676	Hungary	11,526
Sweden	194,337	West India	9,484
Norway	181,729	Portugal	8,138
Scotland	170,136	Cuba	6,917
France	106,971	Spain	5,121
China	104,467	Australia	4,906
Switzerland	88,621	South America	4,566
Bohemia	85,361	India	1,707
Wales	83,302	Turkey	1,205
Mexico	68,399	Sandwich Islands	1,147
Denmark	64,196	Greece	776
Holland	58,090	Central America	77
Poland	48,557	Japan	401
Italy	44,230	Malta	305
Austria	39,663	Greenland	129

The aliens have shown decided preference for the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Ohio, Michigan, New Jersey, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota and California; and 85 per cent. of them have settled in the Northern States.

An idea of the strong preponderance of anti-Prohibition feeling among nearly all classes of the foreign-born element may be obtained from a study of the county returns of elections on the question of Constitutional Prohibition. In the first Amendment contest, in the State of Kansas, the largest anti-Prohibition votes came from the counties bordering on the Missouri River, where the foreign element was strongest; and similarly in Iowa, two years later, the river counties gave decisive majorities for the dramshop. On the other hand, Maine (containing a comparatively small percentage of foreign-born people) showed but an insignificant anti-Prohibition sentiment. In Michigan the majority for the Prohibitory Amendment in 82 of the 83 counties was 16,664; but the eighty-third county (Wayne), embracing the city of Detroit with its immense alien vote, showed a balance against the measure large enough to neutralize this 16,664 and leave a majority of 5,645 for the saloon in the entire State. Rhode Island, which adopted a Prohibitory Amendment while the law restricting the right of suffrage among foreign-born citizens was yet on the statute-books, repealed the Amendment after that restriction had been removed. Equally striking instances might be cited indefinitely.

Nevertheless much progress has been made by the Prohibitionists toward cultivating the favor of foreigners. The Prohibition tendency of the Swedes and Norwegians is markedly strong. Some of their representative newspaper organs earnestly advocate Prohibitory law; and in the Northwestern States—Minnesota, Wisconsin, the Dakotas, etc.,—where the Scandinavians are most numerous, they give exceedingly valuable support to the cause. In fact, it is commonly admitted that without the Scandinavian vote Constitutional Prohibition could not have carried in North Dakota. The English, Welsh and Scotch-Americans, coming from countries where the work of temperance education has long been carried on, exhibit considerable sympathy for the radical movement in this country. Among the Irish at large, Prohibition sentiment makes but slow progress; yet the aggressive fight against the liquor traffic waged by many eloquent and influential Irishmen, like Bishops Ireland and Spalding, T. V. Powderly, Rev. J. M. Cleary and Father Mahoney, and the educational work done by the Catholic Total Abstinence Society, are winning converts. The Hungarians, Poles, Italians, Bohemians, French and Jews seem to oppose the movement with vigor and practical solidity, although encouraging exceptions are to be noted. The Hollanders appear to take a friendlier attitude.

Among the foreign-born citizens of the United States none have sturdier characteristics than the Germans. While giving credit without stint and most cheerfully and admiringly to the German people for all the many excellent traits that distinguish them, the Prohibitionists recognize that the German-Americans as a class constitute probably the most formidable anti-Prohibition factor that is to be contended against, save only the factor represented by the organized liquor traffic. The "personal liberty" argument is peculiarly a German's argument. The men who have established powerful German newspapers, like the New York *Staats-Zeitung*, Chicago *Staats-Zeitung*, Cincinnati *Volksblatt*, St. Louis *Tribüne*, etc., seem to consider it an essential and important part of their political duty and responsibility to share in the leadership of the anti-Prohibition element, if not to formally and persistently represent the dramshop interests. The brewers of the United States are Germans with but very few exceptions, and the proceedings of the brewers' conventions, as well as of many retail liquor-dealers' conventions, are conducted in the German language. The German vote being largely Republican under normal conditions, and being always ready to resent party concessions to the temperance people, it exercises a most important restraining influence upon Republican policy, especially in the States (like Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin and Missouri) where the Germans are very strong. But there is a constantly increasing sympathy for Prohibition among those thoroughly Americanized Germans who give impartial attention to the merits of the question; and when Germans are converted to Prohibition ideas they become earnest and valuable workers. The English-speaking branches of the Lutheran Church rank with the most aggressive denominations. Several German newspapers, notably the *Deutsch-Amerikaner* of Chicago and the *Christliche Apologete* of Cincinnati, have espoused the anti-saloon cause. The German-American Prohibition Association (Henry Rieke of Chicago, President) is one of the most active allies of the Prohibition party.

It is an undeniable and very significant fact that the liquor traffic of the United States is almost exclusively in the hands of foreigners. Inspection of any representative list of brewers or liquor-dealers reveals a strong majority of foreign names.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union is entitled to warm praise for the excellent work that it is doing in behalf of total abstinence and Prohibition through its Foreigners' Department, under the management of Mrs. Sophie F. Grubb. This and similar work must be relied on for winning the co-operation of our adopted citizens. Though stricter immigration and naturalization laws may be and should be advocated by every one who looks with concern upon the baleful influence exerted by the great mass of ignorant and objectionable foreigners, the genius of our institutions as well as the practical attitude of general public sentiment will not permit our Government to apply the radical remedy that is favored by some extremists. Incidental discriminations and not arbitrary and sweeping prohibitions against alien immigration and suffrage are the most that may be reasonably hoped for.

JOHN SOBIESKI.

Fraizer, Samuel.—Born in North Carolina, April 19, 1808, emigrated on foot to Indiana in 1822 and settled on a farm in Marion County, eight miles northwest of Indianapolis. He was one of the earliest pioneers of temperance and total abstinence in the West. In 1830, he married Martha, a daughter of Enoch Evens, and in 1834 he and five of his neighbors organized a total abstinence society, thereby pledging themselves not to have any intoxicating drinks at their house-raisings, log-rollings and other gatherings. Out of this organization grew a strong temperance society, which exerted a great influence for good throughout that region. Soon after the formation of that society Samuel Fraizer began to preach and lecture, and devoted nearly 40 years of his life to the cause of temperance. He was an eloquent speaker, a man of fine presence and goodly countenance, a bold and energetic worker, and wherever he went he shed the light of the gospel of temperance. He was for years what might be called a temperance circuit-rider, going everywhere in spite of bad weather and bad roads, to lecture and circulate total abstinence pledges in the worst neighborhoods he could find. He had a fine voice for singing, and an important feature of his work was to teach children to sing temperance songs from books which he always carried with him. He was also a very good composer, and composed both the words and music of several of the best temperance songs published at that time. Of these, his favorite and one which he always sang with great effect, began with the words,

"Touch not the cup! It is death to thy soul!"

In 1859 he removed from Indiana to Jasper County, Ia., where he began anew his pioneer work in the cause of temperance. From this time his field of labor really extended from Iowa through Illinois to his old home in Indiana; and there are now living thousands of young and middle-aged men who signed the pledge for the first time in response to his teachings. In 1875, advancing age compelled him to rest from active labor, and he died at Monroe, Jasper County, Ia., on Jan. 15, 1887. His funeral was attended by an immense concourse of people, and the text of the funeral discourse, "I have fought a good fight," might well have been chosen by the patriarch himself. W. T. HORNADY.

France.—The history of the progress of intemperance in France during the latter half of the 19th Century strikingly illustrates the fallacy of the High License project, as well as of the idea that the alcohol vice can be eradicated by the promotion of education alone. With a thorough system of free parochial schools and the enormous circulation of popular newspapers, the population of the larger French cities is, on the whole. better instructed and certainly less illiterate, in the book-reader's sense of the word, than that of any other portion of the civilized world. Yet, as an American reformer well observes: "Education is the cure of ignorance, but ignorance is not the cause of intemperance. Men who drink generally know better than others that the practice is foolish and hurtful. They drink because appetite, when stimulated by temptation, is stronger than reason." In the absence of Prohibitory laws, the mere restlessness of discontent (incident to personal misfortune or public calamities) may fatally strengthen the seductiveness of the poison vice, and it is a suggestive fact that in France the epidemic increase of intemperance dates from the decadence of national prestige. During the golden age of French literature, up to the death of Louis XIV, the French nobles were less addicted to alcoholic excesses than those of any other part of contemporary Europe. The gross intemperance of their eastern neighbors was a topic of constant raillery to the upper classes of a nation which, partly by favor of climate and partly by the instinct of refinement, had learned to dispense with the revels of the taproom. During the prime of the 1st Empire Frenchmen were intoxicated with military glory, but like their idolized leader they detested drunkenness; and the phenomenal increase of alcoholism dates only from the middle of the present century, when despotism and the enormous increase of taxation began to foster a spirit of dissipation which has exploded in numerous more or less successful attempts at political revolt, but in the meanwhile has begotten disposition to drown its disappointments in the Lethe of the poison vice.

The humiliating results of the Franco-Prussian War have done much to increase that tendency. The crushing burden of the national debt, the rapid increase in the price of all necessaries of life, the failure of colonial enterprise have all co-operated to stimulate the fierceness of industrial competition to an unparalleled degree and have driven millions to seek refuge in the delusive enjoyments of the rumshop, through want of leisure for better recreations. If evils of that kind could be checked by High License the experiment ought to have triumphantly succeeded in Paris, where liquor-vendors have to pay an exorbitant tax, or rather a variety of taxes, under all possible names —tax for the liquor itself, for the right of selling it to customers who drink their drams at the bar, for the privilege of selling spirits with other refreshments, for the permission to attract guests by musical entertainment, etc., etc. Yet the number of those poison-dens steadily increases, as well as their power for mischief, for it is a curious fact (conclusively refuting the sophistry of the advocates of the milder alcoholics) that in the land of cheap and abundant wine, strong beer and absinthe (wormwood and fusel brandy) have almost eclipsed the popularity of all other intoxicants. "The drinking of absinthe," says a correspondent of the London *Telegraph*, "threatens to rank with the chief curses of France. Although she holds the first place among the wine-growing countries, it is not wine but absinthe which, next to coffee, is becoming the favorite drink of the numberless cafés. To unaccustomed palates the taste of the liquid is absolutely revolting—at once bitter, sickly, nauseous, like some foul decoction of the sick-room. But with constant use the bitterness and the sickly odor become ambrosial elements. . . . France, indeed, has more reason to dread absinthe than she has to fear Prince Bismarck."

Thus far, restrictive laws are applied to the suppression of the symptoms, rather than to the removal of the cause; heavy fines are exacted for drunkenness and disorderly conduct, while the panderers of the drink vice are permitted to multiply unhindered. A party, strong in moral power if not in numbers, is, however, beginning to advocate the adoption of the "Gothenburg system" (Local Option and restrictive by-laws), and their influence is strengthened by the primitive habits of the country population, especially in the south and southeast of France, where industry and economy go hand in hand with a degree of abstemiousness unequalled in any other Christian country, northern Spain perhaps alone excepted.

FELIX L. OSWALD.

Additional Particulars.—In the article on CONSUMPTION OF LIQUORS are given statistical tables, compiled from "Annuaire Statistique de la France," showing the annual production, importation, exportation, and the average consumption per capita of population in France, during each year from 1870 to 1885 inclusive, of distilled spirits and wine, respectively. These tables show a startling increase in the consumption of distilled spirits, the annual per capita consumption having advanced from 0.58 gallon in 1870 to 1.24 gallon in 1885; whereas the average annual consumption of wine per capita decreased from 37.90 gallons in 1870 to 26.74 gallons in 1886. But even these figures do not fully exhibit the frightful development of the appetite for fiery liquors in the greatest wine-producing nation of the earth. In 1850, according to "Annuaire Statistique" for 1888, the consumption per capita of distilled spirits in France was only 0.39 gallon. Therefore the per capita consumption of the stronger liquors increased in 25 years from less than two-fifths of a gallon to a gallon and one-quarter—the amount per inhabitant in 1885 being more than three times that in 1850.

Indeed, statistical authorities are agreed in ranking contemporary France with the most drunken of nations. Mulhall (edition of 1886) actually places her at the head, estimating that the average annual consumption of alcohol per inhabitant in France is 2.65 gallons, as against 2.60 gallons per capita in Denmark, which stands second on Mulhall's list.

This extraordinary situation in France is potent if not conclusive evidence against the claim that temperance will be promoted by popularizing wines. As a matter of fact, there is abundant proof that the wine habit is the root of the evil among the French. Dr. F. R. Lees, in his "Text-Book of Temperance" (pp. 151–2), presents the following striking information:

> "It is true that in large districts, and chiefly the most ignorant, there is little drunkenness and crime (a fact to which Quetelet refers), but that is owing to the fact of the extreme rarity of wine-shops, and to the extreme poverty of the people. In the rich and manufacturing parts intemperance and its resulting evils abound. Dr. Morel of the St. Yon Asylum says in his work 'On the Degeneracy of the Human Race,' that 'there is always a hopeless number of paralytic and other insane persons in our hospitals whose disease is due to no other cause than the abuse of alcoholic liquors. In 1,000 patients of whom I have made special note, at least 200 of them owed their mental disorder to no other cause' (p. 109). Many more, therefore, would be indirectly affected or aggravated by drink. M. Behic, in his 'Report on Insanity,' says: 'Of 8 797 male and 7 069 female lunatics, 34 per cent. of the men and 6 of the women were made insane by intemperance. This is the most potent and frequent cause.'
>
> "French journals note that years of plenty in the wine districts are years of disorder and crime for the country at large. The 'Annals of Hygiene' for 1863 observes that in wine-growing countries delirium tremens and alcoholism are most frequent. The plain fact is, that though partly owing to the temperament of the people, and partly to the better arrangements of the police, outrageous and besotted drunkenness may be less frequent or less apparent, yet the serious and essential evils are as great there as in any country. Sensuality pervades their

life, crime is very prevalent, suicides are in excess, population is arrested and extreme longevity is rarer than in almost any other land.

"In France everybody drinks, young and old, male and female, and we find one centenarian amongst 360,000 persons; in the United States of America, one in every 9,000. Sixteen years ago Dr. Bell estimated the whole of the alcohol drank in France, in the shape of spirit, wine and cider, as equal to four gallons of proof spirit per head annually, for all ages, men, women, and infants. It is certainly not less now. . . . In France, in 1856, there were 360 000 drink-shops besides inns, cafes, etc.; over all France, one drinkery to 100 persons of all ages. De Watteville, the economist, puts drinking third in order among 15 direct causes of pauperism. . . . With such habits and temptations and examples, can we wonder that every third birth in Paris is illegitimate, and that there are 60,000 criminals permanently residing in the prisons of the Seine? Mr. Dickens's 'Household Words,' while defending the beer-shop at home [England], thus discourses of its counterpart abroad: 'The wine-shops are the colleges and chapels of the poor in France. History, morals, politics, jurisprudence and literature, in iniquitous forms, are all taught in these colleges and chapels, where professors of evil continually deliver these lessons, and where hymns are sung nightly to the demon of demoralization. In these haunts of the poor theft is taught as the morality of property, falsehood as the morality of speech, and assassination as the justice of the people. It is in the wine-shop the cabman is taught to think it heroic to shoot the middle-class man who disputes his fare. It is in the wine-shop that the workman is taught to admire the man who stabs his faithless mistress. It is in the wine-shop the doom is pronounced of the employer who lowers the pay of the employed. The wine-shops breed—in a physical atmosphere of malaria and a moral pestilence of envy and vengeance—the men of crime and revolution. Hunger is proverbially a bad counsellor, but drink is a worse.'"

In France the taxes on liquor licenses constitute the largest single item in that part of the Government income derived from special internal taxes on occupations, etc. In 1885, according to "Annuaire Statistique" for 1888 (p. 440), the Government revenue from liquor-dealers', brewers' and distillers' licenses was 12,636,792.95 francs, or about $2,500,000; this did not include the revenue from duties levied on alcoholic liquors themselves. In the same year the revenues of the Government from import and inland duties on wines, ciders, perries and meads aggregated 149,282,522.14 francs (about $29,400,000).

The municipal governments of France, besides obtaining large revenues from the drink-sellers licensed by them, impose special duties, called octroi duties, on all liquors brought into their respective communities. The principle of octroi duties is the same as that of customs duties, save that octrois are levied by the local instead of the national authorities, and are assessed upon all taxable merchandise, whether foreign or domestic. The octroi returns of the city of Paris for 1385 show that there were brought into Paris in that year 4,409,779 hectoliters (about 116,400,000 gallons) of wine, yielding a total octroi duty of 46,836,125 francs (about $9,225,000); 260,600 hectoliters (about 6,880,000 gallons) of cider, perry and mead, yielding an octroi duty of 1,042,401 francs (about $205,400), and 143,269 hectoliters (about 3,800,000 gallons) of spirits, yielding an octroi of 11,433,041 francs (about $2,250,000). Therefore from the octroi on liquors alone the city of Paris realized nearly $11,700,000 in 1885; meanwhile in the same year the total octroi duty of Paris from all sources was 134,509,900 francs (about $26,500,000), so that more than 44 per cent. of the revenue from this species of taxation was due to liquors. In the whole of France outside of Paris the total octrois of all the communities from liquors were as follows in 1885: wines, 24,480,823 francs; cider, perry and mead, 3,262,644 francs; spirits, 9,322,859 francs—total from all liquors, 37,066,326 francs (about $7,300,000); total octrois from all sources in the same communities, 141,523,244 francs (about $27,900,000); so that in the whole of France outside of Paris the octrois from liquors constituted more than 26 per cent. of those from all sources.[1] These figures, when it is remembered that they represent the revenue from only one branch of purely local liquor taxation, give an idea of the enormous property interests involved in the liquor traffic in France; and, when considered in connection with the ratio between the octrois from liquors and those from all sources, they show to how great an extent the expenses of the French municipal governments are defrayed from the products of liquor taxation.

No important remedial work against intemperance has been attempted, although the Government has prohibited the use of absinthe in the army and navy and has conducted inquiries concerning the evils produced by the liquor traffic. The alcohol question has excited the interest of scientists more than of philanthropists in France. The *Société Française de Temperance* does not enforce abstinence even from spirits, but enjoins moderation.

---

[1] Annuaire Statistique for 1888, pp. 462–5.

Free Baptists.—Their General Conference, at Harper's Ferry, W. Va., October, 1889, declared, in part:

"We believe that the traffic in intoxicating liquors. as a beverage, is of such a character that its license by government, under any conditions or restrictions whatsoever, is wrong in principle, and, therefore, to be refused by Christian people; that the conscience of the liquor dealer is so debauched that he cannot be trusted to abide by the conditions of his license, provided it is granted him; that the Prohibitory features of a license law are more difficult to enforce than a strictly Prohibitory law; that the palace saloon with its sanction of law, is a greater peril to the young, especially, than the outlawed low groggery, which High License claims to suppress. We demand, nevertheless, of the officers of the law the enforcement of the Prohibitory features of existing license laws, and most heartily commend the work of Law and Order Leagues. As it is only through the ballot that the church can directly introduce its principles into State life, it becomes our duty in national, State and local elections to use this great power for the advancement of Prohibition, and for the election to office of men committed to this principle and practice."

Free Methodists—The last General Conference of this denomination declared, in part:

"This is our motto: Total abstinence for the individual moral suasion for the drunkard and Prohibition from shore to shore. Our Discipline commits us to Prohibition. We believe we should not only support the principle of Prohibition. but the party that is the chief exponent of that principle. To advocate the principle of Prohibition without a party to carry it into force, is like having a soul without a body in which it can dwell. Foremost on every other work of reform, we cannot afford to be behind here. The same reasons which are brought against party action argue strongly against our existence as a church. In the onward march of truth, God has ever had to thrust out men who would take up the new idea and push it on to victory. To reform dead churches and corrupt political organizations is impossible. Reforms never go backward; Onward is the watchword. . . . While we recognize the fact that there are good men in the old political organizations, we are not blind to the fact that the parties, as such, are under the iron heel of the rum power We cannot gain Prohibition through either of them."

Friends.—The Friends, or Quakers, while not represented by national gatherings, hold Yearly Meetings throughout the country. These Yearly Meetings when touching upon the liquor question invariably take radical ground. The Friends are among the most earnest advocates of Prohibition and opponents of compromise measures.

Gambrell, Roderick Dhu.—Born in Nansemond County, Va., Dec. 21, 1865, and was assassinated in Jackson, Miss., May 5, 1887. His parents soon after his birth removed to Mississippi, where his father, J. B. Gambrell, became prominent as a Baptist clergyman, editor and Prohibitionist. Roderick studied at the State University at Oxford, and afterwards at Mississippi College at Clinton. Both his parents were enthusiastic temperance workers. When Roderick was 19 years old his father and uncle bought the State organ of the Prohibitionists, the *Argus*, and continued it under the name of the *Sword and Shield*, with Roderick as its editor. His vigorous paragraphs soon attracted attention. He removed the paper to Jackson, the State capital. Soon afterwards a saloon-keeper near his office, to whose violations of law he had called notice, visited the editor and undertook to terrorize him. The attempt was not a success, but this affair culminated in the destruction of the office and outfit by fire. In two weeks' time the publication of the *Sword and Shield* was resumed. Roderick read the legislative journals, covering 12 years, and familiarized himself with the political history of that period and the record of every public man. His fearless exposures of political rascals and law-breaking saloon-keepers led to numerous threats against his life; but he paid no attention to them. He received but meagre financial support, and he frequently worked night and day to get out his paper, performing both the literary and the mechanical work.

In the Hinds County Local Option contest of 1886 the whiskey element was led by Col. J. S. Hamilton of Jackson, whose policy was to mass the negroes on the side of the saloon. During the campaign, which was the most exciting one ever conducted in the State, Roderick Gambrell and John Martin edited a daily Prohibition paper, and Hamilton issued an anti-Prohibition journal. The fight resulted in a victory for temperance and weakened Hamilton's influence in Mississippi. In April, 1887, Col. Hamilton was named for renomination to the State Senate. The *Sword and Shield* opposed his candidacy on the ground that he was the leader of the worst element of society, that he was a defaulter to the State in the sum of $80,000, and that he had personal interests depending upon legislation. It was Gambrell's purpose to force him to face his record, but when told that Hamilton would not be a candidate he said: "That ends it; I have no disposition to say a word about him except as the public welfare demands it." Between 9 and 10 on the evening of May 5, 1887, as Gambrell was on the way to his home, he was shot down. A number of pistol shots, a cry of "Murder!" and the sound of heavy blows were heard by wayfarers, and running up they found the young man dying, while standing about him were Hamilton, with his coat-sleeve on fire and two pistol wounds in his body; Albrecht, a saloon-keeper and gambler, holding in his hand a large pistol dripping with blood; Eubanks, a man employed by Hamilton; Figures, a gambler, and Carraway, City Marshal of Jackson, and Hamilton's special friend. Gambrell's face was mutilated by blows from the butt of the pistol. The evidence before the coroner pointed clearly to assassination. There were threats made of lynching, but Rev. J. B. Gambrell, the boy's father, published an appeal for a lawful trial. The first trial resulted in the sentence of Hamilton and Eubanks to jail, the release of Albrecht on bond and the unconditional release of Figures. The final trial of Hamilton was held in the adjoining county of Rankin, before a jury summoned by a Deputy Sheriff, himself under indictment for felony, who boasted that he was Hamilton's friend and that he had "fixed" four of the jurors. The acquittal of the prisoner was a foregone conclusion. Upon his release his partisans escorted him to Jackson with noisy demonstrations.

Gambrinus.—A fabled king of Brabant, a duchy in the Netherlands. He is reputed to have discovered the secret of brewing beer; and for this discovery he is honored in Germany and Holland as the patron saint of the brewers. He is commonly pictured as a Flemish cavalier of the Middle Ages, with the insignia of his rank as king and duke, and holding in his hand a glass of foaming beer.

Georgia.—See Index.

German Baptists (Dunkards).—For more than a hundred years the manufacture, sale and use of intoxicants as beverages have been unsparingly condemned by this denomination. It claims to have been the first—after the Quakers—to make Prohibition a test of fellowship. The Dunkards take no part in politics beyond quietly depositing their ballots. Hence their caution against "public agitation," by which they mean political demonstrations. Their last National Conference, which met at Harrisonburgh, Va., June 12, 1889, passed the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this Annual Conference recommend that all our brethren carefully maintain our position against the use or toleration of intoxicants, whether to manufacture, to sell or use as a beverage, and to the extent of our influence contribute our part to secure practical Prohibition; but that we be advised against taking part in the public agitation of the subject."

German Reformed Church.—The General Synod, convened at Akron, O., June, 1887, incorporated in its declarations the following:

"Resolved, That we view with profound regret and sorrow the great evil of intemperance, and especially its sad and deadly fruits—crime, poverty, and temporal and eternal death,—and that we here and now, before God and the nation, record our protest against it and earnestly call upon our Synods, classes and churches to unite with us in zealous and persistent Christian efforts looking towards its speedy extermination."

Germany, the perfect type of a beer-drinking country, has had a liquor question to deal with from the dawn of her history. Cæsar makes no mention of the German national drink, but Tacitus and Diodorus, who wrote but little later, give us some idea of the extent and results of beer-drinking.

The consumption of liquor has been growing from bad to worse until there are to-day in Germany about 90,000[1] distilleries, large and small, producing between 60,000,000 and 80,000,000 gallons of alcohol, of which about one-fourth is used for scientific and mechanical purposes, and the remaining three-fourths is drunk by the people or exported. This pure alcohol when put in drinkable form would show many times larger figures if the statistics could be had. In addition to the distilleries there are between 9,000 and 10,000 breweries, which annually furnish the German Empire with upwards of 1,100,000,000 gallons of beer, entailing an annual waste of over 600,000 tons of grain. And the manufacture is ever on the increase in order to keep up with the increase in demand. Besides distilled and malt liquors there are native and imported wines. The yearly production of native wines amounts, approximately, to 76,000,000 gallons,[1] of which only 1,150,000 gallons are exported, and there are foreign wines imported to the amount of 18,000,000 gallons yearly.[2]

---

[1] All figures herein cited, if nothing is said to the contrary, are taken from the "Statistisches Jahrbuch für das Deutche Reich," and the "Monatshefte zur Statistik des Deutschen Reiches" (1889).

These liquors are sold to the German public in more than 259,600 public houses, a proportion of one drinking-place to less than 175 of the whole population. The figures do not take into account the numerous places where wine and beer are sold in bottles and not consumed on the premises. In the larger cities the number of inhabitants to one dramshop is much smaller: for instance, Pförten has one to every 55 of population, Hamburg one to every 70, and Berlin one to every 90.[3] And the number of drinking-places is increasing in a much greater ratio than the population; in some of the States the number has been known to more than double itself in five years. These "saloons" – for by this name they may be called, whether with or without screens—have as many peculiarities as those in America, and they may be divided into exactly the same classes. The keepers, too, closely resemble their brethren in trade in the United States, the majority being systematic lawbreakers. They see men being ruined by their traffic, but shut their eyes and do not hesitate to fill again and again the drunkard's glass. If cash is not given they are not unwilling to take anything that may be offered as security; for he who is once in their debt must come again. And when money and credit both are gone they get satisfaction with fist and boot.

The power of granting licenses is vested in the city governments; and in most cities licenses are issued almost without discrimination. In some places ordinances are in force which make the granting depend upon the "need." Practically, however, a new saloon is "needed" when there is no other upon the same premises. The wish of the residents or the distance from another dramshop does not enter into the question of need. The license fee is nowhere more than $12, and this fee, when paid at the opening of the drinking establishment, entitles the proprietor to do business without paying subsequent annual fees. This license holds good as long as the licensed saloon continues in the same place and under the management of the same licensee or his heirs.

Who drinks all this liquor? Practically all the people, high and low, old and young, men and women, educated and uneducated, participate in the drinking. The university professor, at the close of the hour's session, often invites the students to go and take beer with him. The students' societies invariably hold their meetings in saloons; the duels are fought in saloons; it is a common saying among students that beer is more important to a university than either students or professors. All the student's pleasures and recreations center around his foaming glass. In student life it is beer first, last and all the time, and it is said with truth that students drink more beer than any other class in the Empire. Many a Munich student has boasted of swallowing his 30 glasses—*i. e.*, quarts—of beer in one night, and yet not found it necessary to be carried home. Even the boys in school by classes set apart one evening in the week for beer-drinking. However, no such ruinous custom as treating is known, and thus much drunkenness, which otherwise would certainly follow, is prevented.

The working classes drink more whiskey than beer, for the simple reason that it is much cheaper.[4] Almost every workman carries his penny flask of poison with him, and has recourse to it many times during the day. Most of those who have no houses of their own content themselves with a dinner of weak, innutritious food, costing less than ten cents, and indulge in the luxury of a glass of beer costing four or five. The entire sum would buy a good, wholesome dinner, but the mere suggestion that men would do better to live by food without intoxicating drink would be resented as a proposition to starve the laborer.

---

[1] The average yearly production is over 116,600,000 gallons, according to Meyer's "Konversations Lexikon" (article on "Wein").

[2] For detailed statistics, see CONSUMPTION OF LIQUORS.

[3] A. Lammers, in "Deutsche Zeit und Streitfragen."

[4] The liter (quart) of beer costs from 7½ cents to 12½ cents, while the liter of whiskey costs 20 cents; but a *glass* of whiskey costs only one cent, while a glass of beer costs from four to six cents.

Worse than this is the drinking in the home. Liquor in bottles and casks is brought into the houses of rich and poor alike, and a species of drunkenness a hundred times worse than that of the street too often destroys domestic happiness.[1] Especially on Sundays do people in the country get together and drink liquor by the cask; and no ceremony, be it a birthday celebration, a baptism, a marriage or even a funeral, is complete without free alcoholic indulgence. Drunken pall-bearers, drunken mourners, drunken wedding-guests, drunken bride and groom even, and drunken sponsors desecrate the holy services. And even babes in their cradles are given whiskey to keep them still.[2] Among professional men there is less indiscriminate "swilling" of intoxicants. Some of the best doctors drink beer only in the evening, after their professional duties are done, so that they may have an opportunity to sleep off the dulling, stupefying effects of it. The same is true of literary men. But they all set wine before their guests, and drink more or less of it when alone.

What are the immediate results of so much drink?

1. *Drunkenness.*—Not only German whiskey but also German beer makes people drunk. It is undoubtedly incomparably better and less injurious than American beer, but it is also unquestionably intoxicating, and many a man, accustomed to it from his childhood, can not drink so much as three glasses of "good beer" and pretend to be sober. It is often said that among beer-drinking people there is but little intoxication. This statement may be accounted for by the elasticity of the term. Many will not admit that a man is drunk until he falls down and "reaches up for the ground," or that a man can be a drunkard until he reaches the stage of delirium tremens. Even the President of the only active "temperance" society in Germany declares that "a man may get drunk a good many times without being in the least addicted to drink *or in danger of becoming so.*"[3] The most serious obstacle in the way of proof on this point is that there are absolutely no statistics about drunkenness. There are no arrests made for "drunkenness," or for "drunkenness and disorderly conduct." The public conscience is so indifferent to such offences that a law against them is not warranted. The only official statistics to be mentioned are the reports of insane asylums for Prussia. Of 28,300 patients treated, 2,558, or nearly 10 per cent., had delirium tremens, and a majority of the rest, the physicians declare, came there through the immediate use of alcoholic drink. Whoever says that drunkenness is not widespread in Germany either wilfully misrepresents or is densely ignorant of the facts. The streets are crowded with persons in all stages of drunkenness.

2. *Insanity.*—(See the figures above.)

3. *Crime.*—Here, again, accurate statistics are wanting. It is safe to say that in a country where drinking is so general very few crimes are committed by men free from the influence of liquor. Those who are in position to know declare that liquor is directly responsible for a large part if not a majority of all violations of law.[4] The classification of crimes as given in the criminal statistics for 1889 seems fully to bear out this statement.

4. *Domestic Misery.*—Homes are destroyed and happiness is changed to woe, here as everywhere else where intoxicating liquors are tolerated. The work-worn, care-worn wives often tell the story, not by their faces only but in sad words as well.

5. *Poverty.*—The wretched condition of the poor in Great Britain can be duplicated in but few parts of the German Empire. But poverty and want are vis-

---

[1] Lammers, "Deutsche Zeit und Streitfragen," x., p. 182.

[2] See also Dr. Baer, "Der Alcoholismus," etc.

[3] Lammers "Deutsche Zeit und Streitfragen," x., p. 183.

[4] See "Deutsche Zeit und Streitfragen," x., p. 179; and also the report of the "Jahresversammlung des Deutschen Vereins gegen Misbrauch geistiger Getränke" (1887).

ible on every hand. He who looks for the causes of poverty here will find at least nine cases in every ten due to immoderate whiskey-drinking.[1] If that is true, probably 9 per cent. more are chargeable to immoderate beer-drinking. Inside the almshouses are 32,424 people brought there by their own drinking, besides the hundreds of thousands left helpless by the drunkenness of those who should have been their supporters.

6. *Immorality.*—Prostitution is recognized and licensed by the Government. It goes hand in hand with the saloon. In Berlin more than 10,000 fallen women are immediately connected with the rumshops. Drink rouses the passions, and herein we find at least one reason why a considerable proportion of all the children born in Germany are illegitimate.

7. The most patent result of all is *stupefaction.* In no country are the common people, on the average, so stupid and dull as in Germany. The common laborer is the embodiment of stupidity. The German public schools are said to stand first in the world; primary education is compulsory for all; but the effects of so much beer consumed by the fathers and the children for so many generations cannot fail to neutralize these advantages.

With so many evidences of the evils resulting from drink in Germany, the continued apathy of the people seems remarkable. The women, who in America exercise so powerful an influence for reform, are indifferent or hostile in Germany. Very few of the German women are total abstainers or favor total abstinence. They are at the best a negative factor. The clergy, as a rule, are inert. At the universities the theological students frequently rank with the freest drinkers, and they manifest little sympathy for radical temperance principles when they come to the pulpit. The vast majority of the people regard the saloon as a necessary contributor to their comfort and convenience, and are opposed to any interference with it by legislation or by moral suasion. There is, however, a so-called "Society Against the Abuse of Spirituous Liquors," which claims to be the only national temperance organization. It has between 11,000 and 12,000 members, who are not, however, total abstainers. Meetings are too frequently held in drinkshops, and beer is indulged in. The Society's fight is chiefly against whiskey, and moderation is the only thing preached. The President, in an essay in "Deutsche Zeit und Streitfragen" x., p. 179), laments over the "thousands or rather millions of drunkards in the nation," and arraigns drink as the parent of "the majority of all crimes and offenses, of all pauperism and wrong;" yet on the same page declares for "the old national German drink, beer." "It is not necessary," he says (Ibid, p. 185), "that the jolly, harmless carousal, accompanied by song, shall be eliminated from our national life, to which it lends one of the peculiar and inexpressible charms;" and "total abstinence, unless recommended by a physician, is not a moral precept." A temperance society founded on such beliefs has of course accomplished nothing of real advantage.

At one time there were progressive temperance organizations in Germany. They were introduced from America by Robert Baird in 1837, but their roots never went deep, the soil not being congenial; and when the troubles of 1848 came the total abstinence movement died a natural death. It is seldom heard of now, although some individual efforts are being made. It seems well-nigh hopeless to preach abstinence in a nation of drinkers, where in almost every block, in every railway station, on every road, at every point of interest the open saloon is not only tolerated but not combated.

The only serious undertaking of any breadth was that inaugurated in 1884 by the Society Against the Abuse of Spirituous Liquors, which appointed a committee to inquire into the results of reform movements in foreign countries and to recommend a policy for Germany. This committee found its ideal not in Kansas or Maine (for such an ideal would exclude the beloved beer and wine) but in the Swedish and Norwegian method of dealing with the whiskey curse—the so-called Gothenburg system. It proposed by education and legislation to take the whiskey-selling business out of the hands of the lower classes and give it over to the cultivated, well-to-do, and generally best-meaning classes, who will control it for the "common good." Then the "tempters" are to be removed by placing disinterested persons in charge of the sale, so that no one already drunk and no minor may obtain drink; and suitable penalties are to be provided. The committee argued that with the whole business under the supervision of one authority the number of whiskey-shops would be materially reduced. Further restrictions would be imposed by compelling these establishments to open late in the morning and close early at night, and by requiring that no sales be made on Sunday save a single glass per individual at dinner time, that the rest and sanctity of the Sabbath might be protected. The profits (the committee intimated) should be devoted to the common welfare and to reducing taxation.

---

[1] See "Volkswirthschaftliche Zeitfragen," iv., essay 4, p. 4.

The Society has founded some coffee-houses, but beer is offered for sale in nearly all of them. Even the Y. M. C. A. rooms in many cities have drinking-bars. It is suggested that "the beginning of the reform must be made by the Government, which, as it owns the railways, can make an end of the evils of drink by offering in the railway lunch-rooms only good fermented liquors, coffee, tea and chocolate." Another plan is to restrict the number of saloons on the basis of population, as is done in Holland. The advocates of Governmental action have no real hope, however, of securing even these slight and illusive benefits. The German Government derives a yearly income of nearly $30,000,000 from spirits alone, and fully as much from beer, and its whole policy is to encourage the drink trade. As things stand at present it is safe to say that not one member of the Reichstag would vote for any measures aimed at beer and wine. Even the Courts appear to encourage drunkenness; for the tendency of German jurisprudence is to recognize that intoxication is a cogent excuse for acquitting a criminal or mitigating the severity of the sentence.[1] But the military law punishes acts of insubordination or neglect of duty while under the influence of liquor by sentencing the guilty to five years of hard labor.

WALTER MILLER.
(Leipzig.)

Gin.—See SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS.

Goodell, William.—Born in Coventry, N. Y., in 1792, and died in Janesville, Wis., Feb. 14, 1878. In his youth he worked as a clerk, farm-hand and school-teacher; and while employed as a bookkeeper in New York he assisted in founding the Mercantile Library Association of that city. In 1827 he started the *Investigator* in Providence, R. I., the second paper devoted to the temperance cause in the history of the movement. In 1829 he removed to Boston and united the *Investigator* with the *National Philanthropist*, which, started in 1826, was the pioneer temperance journal. In 1830 he removed to New York and with the assistance of Phineas Crandall began the publication of the *Genius of Temperance*. He edited the *Youth's Temperance Lecturer* also, and published the *Female Advocate*, sustained by Christian women and devoted to social and moral purity. The publication of the *Emancipator* in the interest of the Anti-Slavery cause (commenced in 1834) brought the bitterest persecution upon him. He assisted in forming the American Anti-Slavery Society and the Liberty party. In 1836 he removed to Utica, N. Y., and became editor of the *Friend of Man*, State organ of the Liberty party. He also labored as a lecturer and a minister of the gospel. He endeavored to induce the churches to take a radical stand against slavery, and he was for nine years pastor of a church at Honeoye Lake, N. Y. While holding this pastorate he published in two volumes his "Democracy of Christianity," and also issued a constitutional argument against slavery. Later on he published "Our National Charter," the "American Slave Code" and a "History of Slavery and Anti-Slavery." While residing at Honeoye Lake he was nominated by the Liberty party for Governor of New York. In 1852 he removed to New York City to become editor of the *Radical Abolitionist*. He was one of those present with Mr. Lincoln, strengthening and encouraging him, on the night before the famous Proclamation of Emancipation was issued. After the war Mr. Goodell wrote for various papers in advocacy of total abstinence and Prohibition. He aided in organizing the Prohibition party at Chicago in 1869. In 1870 he removed with his wife to Janesville, Wis. In June, 1874, he attended the reunion of Abolitionists at

---

[1] This tendency of the German Courts is discussed at length in the report for 1887 (pp. 41-3) of the "Jahresversammlung des Deutschen Vereins gegen den Misbrauch geistigen Getränke."

Chicago, and from that time until his death he continued to write, preach and lecture in behalf of temperance.

Good Templars.—See INDEPENDENT ORDER OF GOOD TEMPLARS.

Gospel Temperance.—A name commonly applied to temperance work and workers whose methods are distinctively evangelistic or persuasive, relying upon the influence of exhortation, prayer, song, the pledge, the church, etc. Gospel temperance effort is but another name for moral suasion effort, the object being to reform inebriates and enlist supporters for the temperance cause by appealing especially to the emotional nature of individuals, their consciences, their religious feelings and, in short, all their better instincts. Gospel temperance movements have been crowned with great success in the United States, Canada, Great Britain, Australia and other countries, multitudes having been reclaimed. They have frequently awakened the public sentiment necessary for giving success to Prohibitory campaigns and laws, and many of the most valuable Prohibition agitators have been developed from such movements. Indeed, with very few exceptions the gospel temperance laborers frankly recognize that their work is essentially preliminary and preparatory; that it is impossible to reform drunkards as rapidly as the saloons manufacture them; that of those who do reform, comparatively few are able to permanently resist temptation so long as the legalized saloons exist; that the results of rescue effort, however noble and gratifying, are really insignificant when measured with the conditions ever presented by the fact that multitudes relapse and greater multitudes are never rescued; that the organized drink system, which is the root of the drink evil, can never be exterminated by entreaty however loving or by argument however logical. On the other hand there are very few Prohibitionists who do not look with unqualified approval upon gospel temperance work and encourage it by influence and contributions, understanding that every wholesome educational agency promotes reform.

Gothenburg System.—See SWEDEN.

Gough, John Bartholomew.—Born in Sandgate in Kent, Eng., Aug. 22, 1817; died in Frankford, Pa, Feb. 18, 1886. His family was supported by the earnings of his mother as village school-teacher, and a pension of £20 per annum received by his father for services in the Peninsular War. He was kept at school until his twelfth year, when he emigrated to America with a neighbor's family. After working two years with these people on a farm near Utica, N. Y., he went to New York City and obtained employment in the book-binding department of the Methodist Book Concern, where he learned his trade. In 1833 he had saved sufficient money to send for his mother and sister—his father having died,—but in July, 1834, a little less than a year after her arrival in America, his mother died also.

Young Gough now fell in with evil associates, and entered on a career of dissipation which his marriage in 1839 and the setting up of a small book-bindery on his own account did not check. At the age of 24 he was a hopeless sot. He went to Bristol, R. I., Providence, Boston, Newburyport and Worcester, eking out a scant subsistence by doing small jobs at his trade or by comic acting and singing in low theatres and resorts. "I was now," he writes, "the slave of a habit which had become completely my master, and which fastened its remorseless fangs in my very vitals. . . . I drank during the whole day. . . . So entirely did I give myself up to the bottle that those of my companions who fancied they still possessed some claims to respectability gradually withdrew from my company. At my house, too, I used to keep a bottle of gin, which was in constant requisition. . . . A burning sense of shame would flush my fevered brow at the conviction that I was scorned by the respectable portion of the community. But these feelings passed away like the morning cloud or the early dew, and I pursued my old course."[1] At Newburyport he was induced to attend a temperance meeting addressed by Mr. J. J. Johnson, a reformed drunkard. "My conscience told me that the truth was spoken by the lecturer. As I left the chapel a young man offered me the pledge to sign. I actually turned to sign it, but at that critical moment the appetite for strong drink, as if determined to have the mastery over me, came in all its force; and remembering too, just then, that I had a pint of brandy at home, I deferred signing."[1]

---

[1] Autobiography (Boston, 1847), pp. 38, 40, 42.

In Worcester his wife and child died from the consequences of want and exposure, but even then he did not reform his habits. "Soon it was whispered from one to another until the whole town became aware of it," he confesses, "that my wife and child were lying dead, and that I was drunk! . . . There in the room where all who had loved me were lying in the unconscious slumber of death, was I gazing, with a maudlin melancholy imprinted on my features, on the dead forms of those who were flesh of my flesh and bone of my bone. During the miserable hours of darkness I would steal from my lonely bed to the place where my dead wife and child lay, and in agony of soul pass my shaking hand over their cold faces, and then return to my bed, after a draught of rum, which I had obtained and hidden under the pillow of my wretched couch."[2]

Not long after this, in October, 1842, when he "had no hope of ever becoming a respectable man again – not the slightest"—"believing that every chance of restoration to decent society and of reformation was gone forever," and when he often contemplated suicide and even "stood by the rails, with a bottle of laudanum clattering against" his lips,[3] he was persuaded by Joel Stratton, a Quaker, to go to a temperance gathering and sign the pledge. Encouraged by Mr. Stratton and others he kept his pledge for several months in spite of the most terrible cravings for liquor. "Knowing that I had voluntarily renounced drink, I endeavored to support my sufferings and resist the incessant craving of my remorseless appetite as well as I could; but the struggle to overcome it was insupportably painful. When I got up in the morning, my brain seemed as though it would burst with the intensity of its agony, my throat appeared as if it were on fire, and in my stomach I experienced a dreadful burning sensation, as if the fires of the pit had been kindled there. . . . I craved, literally gasped, for my accustomed stimulus, and felt that I should die if I did not have it. . . . Still, during all this frightful time, I experienced a feeling somewhat akin to satisfaction at the position I had taken. I had made at least one step towards reformation. I began to think that it was barely possible that I might see better days."[4] After a few months of successful resistance to his enemy, he succumbed, but only to confess his weakness in a public meeting and sign the pledge once more. In 1845 he was again under the influence of liquor through a dastardly trick of his enemies, who contrived to have him take a drugged drink in the hope of putting an end to his career as a reformer.

In 1843 he married Mary Whitcombe. Determining to devote his life to the work of rescuing drunkards, he set out on foot, with a carpet-bag, through New England, delivering lectures or telling his experiences wherever he went, and thankful at the start for so much as 75 cents for a night's labor. But his remarkable gift of oratory rapidly developed until he was the best-known temperance speaker in America. In England, which he visited in 1853 upon an invitation from the London Temperance League, his success was equally brilliant, and he prolonged his stay through two years. In 1854 a volume of his "Orations" was issued in England, and soon after there was published in London an edition of his "Autibiography," of which, when first printed in Boston (in 1847), 20,000 copies had been sold within a year. In August, 1855, Gough returned to America. In 1857 he made his second visit to Great Britain, and remained there for three years. In 1878 he visited England for the third time. For 17 years he lectured exclusively on temperance, but in later years he gave many addresses on miscellaneous subjects. In his work he traveled 450,000 miles and delivered 8,606 addresses before more than 9,000,000 people.

He was the great exponent of moral suasion, but he also believed in, and during his last years especially emphasized, the necessity of political action to prohibit the liquor traffic. "Prevention is better than cure," he wrote. "It is worth a life-effort to save a drunkard, to lift a man from degradation. It is worth some self-sacrifice to free a man from moral slavery and debasement; but to prevent his fall is far better. We may reform a man from drunkenness, but I believe no man can ever fully recover from the effects of dissipation and intemperance."[1] Again, he said: "I rejoice in every effort that prohibits, cripples or lessens in any way the sale of intoxicating liquor. . . . While I stand unflinchingly on the platform of total abstinence and absolute Prohibition, combining their forces for the entire abandonment of the drinking customs and the annihilation of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages, I hold out my hand to every worker as far as he can go with me, if it is but a step."[2] During the last two years of his life he acted with the Prohibition party. The conduct of the politicians in many States in withholding from the people the opportunity to vote on Constitutional Prohibition completely disgusted him. "For 42 years," he said in 1884, "I have been fighting the liquor trade—the trade which robbed me of seven of the best years of my life. I have long voted the Republican ticket, hoping always for help in my contest from the Republican party. But we have been expecting something from that party in vain, and now, when they have treated the most respectful appeal, from the most respectful men in this country, with silent contempt, I say it is time for us to leave off trusting and to express our opinion of that party." In a letter published in the *Voice* (Oct. 23, 1884), declaring his intention to support the Prohibition Presidential ticket, he said: "I have one vote to be responsible for. That has always been given for the Republican party from its existence to this present year. . . . I hoped to find in the Republican party, as a party of high moral ideas, protection against the liquor traffic instead of protection for it, and have been unwilling to aid in making this grand cause a foot-ball to be tossed between political parties. . . . This year, however, has seen strange things. Surprising disintegrations have been going on in the two old parties. Both have either open affiliations with, or a cowardly and shameful servility to the arrogant set of rings and lobbies of this drink trade, which lifts its monstrous front of $750,000,000 of money spent directly in it, with an equal sum in addition taxed upon the people to take care of its miserable results." In a letter dated Jan. 30, 1886—19 days before his death,—published in the *Voice* for Feb. 11, he denied the charge that he had repudiated the Prohibition party policy in a recent interview. "I have for two years," he wrote, "voted with the third party; for I do believe in prohibiting and annihilating the liquor traffic."

---

[1] Ibid, pp. 40-1.

[2] Ibid, pp. 52-3.

[3] Ibid, p. 57.

[4] Ibid, pp. 52-3.

While delivering a lecture in Frankford, Pa., Feb. 15, 1886, he was prostrated with a paralytic stroke. Two days later he became unconscious, and he died on Feb. 18. Among the last words uttered by him in his Frankford address were, "Young man, keep your record clean!" In addition to his works already alluded to he published "Platform Echoes," and "Autobiography and Personal Recollections" (1871).

Grain.—Any species of grain may by fermentation under suitable conditions be made to yield an alcoholic beverage, from which by the process of distillation strong spirits may be obtained. The cereals most commonly used by liquor manufacturers in the United States are barley, corn and rye—the ones containing the largest percentages of sugar or starch.

Great Britain.—Although temperance reform has made great progress in the United Kingdom, has won to total abstinence multitudes of converts and to the Prohibition idea many thousands of more or less active sympathizers, has commanded the championship of hosts of able and eminent men in all departments of thought and endeavor, has compelled other hosts to bestow encouraging recognition or to utter words of deep significance, and has left some impressions upon public policy, the liquor traffic is still supreme as a national institution and has not even suffered incidental disturbances of real magnitude, while the fiscal interests of the Government are linked to it by the strongest license and revenue bands. Conditions as now existing are briefly summarized as follows for this work by the well-known Dr. Dawson Burns:

---

[1] Sunshine and Shadow (London, 1881), p. 331.
[2] Ibid, pp. 355-6.

> "The liquor traffic of Great Britain and Ireland consists of the two great departments of manufacture and importation, and wholesale and retail sale. On ardent spirits made or imported there is a tax of 10*s* per gallon; on beer a tax of 6*s* 5*d* per barrel; and wine imported is taxed according to alcoholic strength. There is also a brewers' license when the beer is brewed for sale. Wholesale dealers and all retailers pay license duty,[1] and the entire revenue from liquor in the United Kingdom is about $145,000.000 per annum. Wholesale dealers in spirits and wine, beer-house-keepers licensed before 1869, and holders of wine and spirit licenses for consumption off the premises obtain Excise licenses on certain conditions and payments, but all public house (*i. e.*, saloon) licenses, all beer-houses licensed since 1869, and all beer off-licenses are subject to magisterial control and cannot be obtained without annual certificates from local licensing benches. The retail licenses in England of all kinds number about 130,000, and in Scotland and Ireland about 30.000. Until 1830 all retail licenses were issued subject to magisterial certificates which could be withheld at discretion. All payments have respect only to the Excise Department, and the magisterial certificates are never paid for, but are given or withheld with a supposed regard for the public interest. The Courts of law have recently decided that the magistrates have the power to refuse annual licenses to those who have been previously licensed, so that there is no 'vested interest' in such licenses."

The quantities of distilled spirits, wine and beer consumed in the United Kingdom annually are presented in the article on CONSUMPTION OF LIQUORS.

The vast importance of the drink traffic as a source of revenue is shown by a glance at the receipts of the Government for the year ending March 31, 1889. The entire revenue was £89,883,331, of which the largest single item was the income from domestic liquors and licenses, £23,628,858, or considerably more than one-fourth the whole. In addition to this inland revenue from liquors, the customs duties on liquors yielded £5,518,762, or more than one-fourth the entire customs receipts from all sources.[2]

From calculations made by the late eminent writer on the statistical aspects of drink, William Hoyle, it appears that in 1820 the population of the United Kingdom was 20,807,000, the total estimated cost of intoxicating liquors consumed was $245,469,448, and the average cost of liquors per capita was $11.80; in 1850, according to Mr. Hoyle, these items were, respectively, 27,320,000, $392,814,551 and $14.31; in 1860, 28,778,000, $414,999,888 and $13.26; in 1870, 31,205,000, $577,830,082 and $18.51; in 1880, 34,468,000, $618,407,860 and $17.58. Since 1880 the estimated cost of liquors to the public has been in the neighborhood of $600,000,000, a slightly decreasing tendency having been observed. Mr. Hoyle's figures show that the heaviest expenditure for drink was in the year 1876, when the total cost reached $716,780,746.

The total number of convictions in the United Kingdom for crime from all causes is now about 600,000 annually. The annual apprehensions for drunkenness vary from 175,000 to more than 200,000. In the metropolitan district (London and vicinity), there were 23,638 arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct in 1888, the total population being nearly 5,600,000.

Although the only systems recognized by Parliamentary law are those of license and revenue, the right of Local Option not having yet been conferred, local Prohibition has been established in many places by various means, chiefly by the exercise of legal rights by landowners. On the authority of Dr. Dawson Burns, there are at least 2,000 places in the United Kingdom where the sale of liquors is prohibited. In Liverpool one district, containing 40,000 inhabitants, is under Prohibition; and in London there is one dwellings company possessing three estates on which there are 4,000 houses occupied by 20,000 people, that also prohibits the sale absolutely. But the entire removal of dramshops from the community has been accomplished in but few instances, and in such instances only by resorting to extraordinary methods, since the political power to effect removal is not vested in the people. On the other hand the people, when given opportunities to express themselves on the question of local Prohibition, have manifested a strong preference for taking the whole subject into their own hands. Recent plebescites in Scotland, conducted under the auspices of individuals desirous of testing public sentiment, have resulted in emphatic majorities in favor of deciding the licensing issue at the ballot-box and in behalf of limiting the number of licenses; while a manifest disposition to altogether prohibit the liquor traffic in localities has been exhibited.

---

[1] The saloon or publican's license (*i. e.*, license to sell spirits, beer and wine to be consumed on the premises) varies from £4 10*s* per annum for houses whose annual value is under £10, to £60 per annum for houses whose annual value exceeds £700. Thus the highest annual saloon license rate in Great Britain is about the same as the average rate in the United States. The total Government revenue from publicans' and grocers' licenses for the year ending March 31, 1889, was £1,487,096. (These particulars are taken from "Whitaker's Almanac" for 1890.)

[2] Whitaker's Almanac for 1890, p. 172.

Nor has the demand for popular control been without effect upon Parliament. "The United Kingdom Alliance for the Total and Immediate Suppression of the Liquor Traffic," founded June 1, 1853, has for many years made the principle of popular control the cardinal point of its platform. In Great Britain the term "Local Option" has not the definite signification that is attached to it in the United States: it does not necessarily mean a system of legislation whereby the people of separate communities may wholly suppress the license system, but an elastic system, involving limitation of the number of licenses, more or less severe restrictions, etc., the degree of restriction or Prohibition to be determined by local preference. Therefore the United Kingdom Alliance does not demand the indefinite privilege of "Local Option" but the specific privilege of "Direct Veto"—that is, it asks Parliament to pass an act enabling the electors in each community, by periodical majority votes, to pass a "direct veto" upon the issuance of liquor licenses for their respective communities. The "Direct Veto" idea in Great Britain is precisely equivalent to the Local Option idea in the United States. This idea, under the steady championship of the United Kingdom Alliance, has commanded able support in Parliament by individual members of the House of Commons, especially by Sir Wilfrid Lawson, the President of the Alliance. The Ministry has uniformly failed to pass Direct Veto bills, but the Liberal party, when in power, found it expedient to make concessions to the temperance sentiment. June 18, 1880, the House of Commons, by a majority of 26, passed a resolution declaring that in the opinion of the House a law should be enacted conferring on electors the right to decide for or against the license system; and similar resolutions were passed in 1881 by a majority of 42, and in 1883 by a majority of 87.

Political vicissitudes and the absorbing Irish question have prevented the fulfillment of the pledge implied by the adoption of these resolutions. But the Liberal party is now thoroughly committed to the Direct Veto programme. At the National Liberal meeting at Manchester in December, 1889, the declaration of principles that was adopted pronounced for "the Direct Popular Veto of the liquor traffic."

Generally speaking, the Liberal and Conservative parties of Great Britain stand respectively, in reference to liquor legislation, much as the Republican and Democratic parties stand in the United States. The Liberals profess a progressive spirit and purpose; the Conservatives are avowedly hostile. The Liberals, however, are cautious and given to compromises and delays, and their shrewd political managers have no desire to alienate the very considerable liquor vote now under their control by seriously attacking the traffic. For the sake of temporary advantage, however, the Liberals are very willing to use the strong temperance sentiment of the country in party warfare; and a highly interesting illustration has been afforded in the present Parliament (1890) by the solid Liberal opposition, under Mr. Gladstone's immediate leadership, to the compensation clauses of the Tory Ministry's Licensing bill. (See COMPENSATION.) The Conservatives owe much of their strength to the support that they receive from the great brewers and wealthy publicans; and although twice signally defeated in trying to force compensation upon the country, it seems certain that they will faithfully represent the wishes of the liquor interests in future struggles.

There is an element of advanced Prohibitionists in Great Britain that urges the political doctrine upon which the Prohibition party of the United States is based. Believing that the existing parties will never satisfactorily champion their cause and that the speediest means of forcing it to the front is by independent partisan action, they favor the adoption of that means. But no very important results of the movement are yet apparent.

Notwithstanding all the unfavorable

aspects and results, the political phases of the drink question are incessantly agitated in Great Britain. With so many able writers and speakers constantly presenting testimony and arguments in support of radical views, political leaders cannot avoid touching the issue at many of its vital points. Despite their evasive records and unfriendly performances in dealing with practical measures, nearly all of the foremost statesmen have made memorable and impressive declarations against drink and the drink traffic.

Among the temperance organizations the United Kingdom Alliance, as already indicated, is the most important one working on political and legislative lines. It publishes the *Alliance News*, the leading temperance paper of England. In 1889 the subscriptions received by the Alliance amounted to almost $56,000. The National Temperance League labors for the cause "by means of public meetings, lectures, sermons, tract distribution, domiciliary visitation, conferences with the clergy of all denominations, medical practitioners, schoolmasters, magistrates, poor-law officers and other persons of influence, deputations to teachers and students in universities and colleges, training institutions and schools, missionary efforts among sailors, soldiers and the militia, the police and other classes;" it publishes the *Temperance Record*, the *Medical Temperance Journal* and the *National Temperance Union*, and in 1889 sold temperance literature of the value of $38,750. The Scottish and Irish Temperance Leagues perform similar work, the former publishing the *League Journal* (Glasgow) and the latter the *Irish Temperance League Journal* (Belfast). The British Woman's Temperance Association is made up of women exclusively. The Good Templars, Rechabites and similar benevolent temperance orders are very strong throughout the British Isles.

Of the great denominational societies, the Church of England Temperance Society and the Wesleyan Society have the so-called dual basis—*i.e*, they permit their members to choose between total abstinence and "moderation." The strongest (numerically) of the distinctively religious temperance organizations is probably the Salvation Army, every one of whose members is a pledged abstainer from alcohol and tobacco. All the leading denominations support influential temperance societies. The Blue Ribbon Gospel Temperance movement and the Bands of Hope also co-operate most usefully in the agitation.

Taking the clergymen altogether, there seems to be no doubt that a large majority of them are total abstainers. A much larger proportion of students in the theological colleges are pledged abstainers. Thus, of 404 Congregational students 340 are pledged to total abstinence, and 216 of 235 Baptist students; while in Mr. Spurgeon's "Pastors' College" and the Wesleyan College at Headingly and Richmond there are no exceptions.[1] Nevertheless the churches as organized bodies (with some striking exceptions, of course) are still fairly to be charged with timidity. The Lambeth Conference of 1888 appointed a committee of Bishops to consider the "duty of the church with regard to intemperance," and this Episcopal body was not prepared to recommend so mild a reform as the use of unfermented wine at the sacrament. In the great compensation struggle of 1890, when the anti-compensationists had the advantage of the argument and the enthusiastic support of the country, the attitude of the Church of England was represented to be in favor of a compromise whereby the liquor-traffickers would have been granted the right of compensation for a period of ten years. It is true that individual members of the Church of England Temperance Society protested against this concession; but the proposals in behalf of the Society were made with so much appearance of authority that Mr. Henry Labouchere took occasion in the House of Commons to allude to them as evidence of "an incestuous union between the parson and the pothouse-keeper in favor of the party which it was thought would protect their several interests." Upon the conversion of the great brewing concerns into limited liability companies, persons inspecting the lists of stock subscribers found the names of many clergymen among the shareholders. On the lists of six of these companies the names of 50 clergymen appeared—none of them being of nonconformist denominations, however.[1]

---

[1] Stated on the authority of J. F. B. Tinling, London.

Yet the various manifestations of conservative feeling by the aristocratic clergymen are offset by many noble exceptions in their own ranks. Such examples as those given by Archdeacon Farrar, Canon Wilberforce, the Bishop of London and scores of other divines of the greatest eminence and talent, make it impossible to justly reckon even the Church of England as an undivided opponent of radical action. Few English writers and speakers have done so much as these men to promote total abstinence and justify the growing antagonism to the drink traffic as a factor of national life. And many leaders of the Roman Catholic Church deserve equal praise, especially the recognized head of that church in the United Kingdom, the venerable Cardinal Manning, whose advocacy of the temperance cause is one of the distinguishing features of his life-work.

The restrictive laws for liquor-sellers, notably the partial Sunday-closing laws and the acts forbidding sales to children and drunkards, are violated with impunity throughout the United Kingdom.

Greece.—The writings of the ancient Greeks abound in allusions to drink and drunkenness. Wine was their alcoholic beverage: the art of distillation was then unknown, and the evils of intoxication in the most highly cultivated country of ancient times were wholly due to the drink that is now recommended by certain temperance advocates. History records no more significant practice than that prevailing in Sparta, where the helots or slaves were on certain occasions compelled to drink to excess, that the Spartan youth might be provided with object lessons of the dire consequences of intemperance and thus be warned against indulgence. Drunkards were severely punished in the various Grecian communities. The Draconian laws of Athens pronounced sentence of death upon any individual convicted of drunkenness, and even the milder code of Solon "condemned an Archont (the highest public functionary in Athens after the abolition of royalty, B. C. 1068) to a heavy fine for the first time he was intoxicated, and in case of relapse to death."[1]

In contemporary Greece all the branches of the liquor traffic flourish. In 1886 250,000 acres of the Greek Kingdom were devoted to wine-grapes. Wine is a principal article of export, the value of wines exported in 1888 having been 4,415,000 drachmas (about $750,000). The Government lays a comparatively heavy tax on spirituous liquors, but for revenue objects exclusively. No efforts are made to restrict the use of liquors. Enterprising Greek tradesmen derive large profits from the liquor business in many ports of the Mediterranean.

Greeley, Horace.—Born in Amherst, N. H., Feb. 3, 1811, and died in Pleasantville, N. Y., Nov. 29, 1872.

His devotion to total abstinence and Prohibition principles was lifelong and uncompromising. On his twelfth birthday his mother counseled him to abstain from intoxicating beverages. He replied that he had already thought of that subject and had resolved never to taste liquor. In the numerous addresses that he made, he frequently advocated total abstinence. It is related that in one of his *Tribune* editorials he earnestly urged young men to avoid the tempter in whatever form he might appear, "whether as punch or bitters, as sherry or Madeira, as hock or claret, as Heidsieck or champagne." Other members of the editorial corps who were not total abstainers greeted Mr. Greeley on his entrance to the office that morning with uproarious laughter, telling him that heidsieck was not a different wine from champagne, but only a particular brand. As the laugh went around the room Mr. Greeley said: "Well, boys, I guess I'm the only man in this office that could have made *that* mistake. It don't matter what you call him—champagne, or heidsieck, or absinthe—he is the same old devil."

The New York *Tribune* was founded by Mr. Greeley in 1841. During the early agitation in New York State upon the question of liquor legislation, the *Tribune* was a radical advocate of Prohibition. As early as Feb. 13, 1852 (see the *Tribune* for that date), Mr. Greeley defined the issue in the following powerful language:

"What the temperance men demand is not the regulation of the liquor traffic, but its destruction; not that its evils be circumscribed

---

[1] Foundation of Death, p. 20.

(idle fancy!) or veiled, but that they be, to the extent of the State's ability, utterly eradicated. Such a law we are all willing to stand under and (if such be its fate) fall with; but no shilly-shally legislation can endure, and it would be good for nothing if it would. Stave in the heads of the barrels, put out the fires of the distillery; confiscate the demijohns, bottles and glasses which have been polluted with the infernal traffic; but no act screening great mischief-makers and bearing down on little ones can possibly be fastened on the advocates of temperance. They disown and loathe it.

"For our own part, we are opposed to legalizing the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors for medical, mechanical or any other purpose. There is no need of it, and great harm in it. That alcohol may be useful in various contingencies we do not dispute; for arsenic, opium and other poisons are so, and it is not probable that this single member of the family should have no good end whatever. Let alcohol—pure, undiluted alcohol—be manufactured and sold without license, let doctors and others use it as they shall see fit; but this undisguised poison no one would drink; and we protest against all tampering with, coddling up and disguising it so that the ignorant, the simple, the victims of depraved appetite, shall be tempted to imbibe it where they would reject the naked poison. All such weaving of snares for the feet of the unwary is indefensible, is demoniac and ought to be prohibited by law.

"'But the people are not ready for such stringent legislation.' Well, sir, if you think they are not, take hold and help us make them ready! We maintain that they are, and that the Maine law, in all its primitive rigor, would be sustained by 50,000 majority of the legal voters of our State, and carried into full execution within a year after its passage. Legislators! will you oblige us by submitting it to the people!

"We have just tried five years of 'moral suasion,' and find that rum has gained on us every day. We shall now try five years' legal suasion, if necessary, and see how that will operate. Gentlemen, politicians! choose whether to stand with us or against us, but do not imagine any fence will last long enough to hold you in an equivocal position."

In an editorial upon "Temperance and Law" in the *Tribune* for April 26, 1853, Mr. Greeley wrote:

"We are quite willing—yea, *more* than willing—to see the upholders of license laws devote their energies to the enforcement of those laws in their less exceptionable aspects by a rigorous and united crusade against their violators by Sunday dramselling and their defiers by poisoning without license. It is a work manifestly devolving on them, and to which they are, or should be, especially adapted. To them and their kind this query addresses itself with irresistible force: 'Since you uphold the license system, why do you not take care to make it something else than a fraud and a sham?' But to us, who stand for total abstinence and the Maine law, the hunting and hounding of poor wretches into the payment of a beggarly $10 per annum each [the license fee in New York at that time], for the privilege of poisoning their neighbors, is a business possessing few attractions. For laws which assume to forbid and to punish human acts ought to rest on a basis of morality. For us, who affirm that *alcohol is a poison* and its use as a beverage always hurtful, always perilous, always demoralizing, there is obviously but one consistent, defensible position—that of unqualified and uncompromising hostility to the liquor traffic. If men will poison their neighbors for gain, we greatly prefer that they should do it on their own responsibility, rather than the State's—at all events, we cannot permit them to do it on *ours*. To sell rum for a livelihood seems bad enough; but for a whole community to share the responsibility and the guilt of such a traffic for a beggarly $10, seems a worse bargain than that of Eve or Judas. . . . . Alcohol is a poison; the traffic in alcoholic beverages is an offense against the well-being of society, and ought to be a crime against the laws. The essential wrong is not the lack of a license, but inheres in the business for which a license is demanded; if it were a good business no license for its prosecution should be required; being a bad one no such license should be granted. . . . No practicable enforcement of the license system will ever sensibly mitigate the evils of intemperance. So long as there shall be even 2,000 authorized, legalized, licensed liquor-shops in our city, all who choose to drink will find abundant opportunity, and our youth will mainly be initiated, as fast as they become old enough to elude their parents' vigilance, into the primary degrees of tippling, whence the road is direct and the grade descending to toping and drunkenness. But let the laws inflexibly forbid the sale of alcoholic beverages, and every youth is warned from the cradle that those beverages are hurtful and dangerous, and that in drinking them he encourages a violation of the laws of the land. Such legislation may not at once abolish rumselling, as our present laws against theft and burglary do not utterly extirpate those crimes; but being based on a principle and dealing out equal justice to rich and poor, it must command the respect even of its antagonists and gradually win its way to universal respect and obedience."

An editorial in the *Tribune* for April 29, 1853, on "Temperance and License Laws," contains the following:

"Rumselling is either right or wrong: alcohol is either a poison or no poison—there is no half-way position. If liquor is a good thing essentially—that is, good to drink,—then there ought to be no license required of its sellers. Men hurt themselves by eating too much, or at unseasonable hours; yet we do not require a license to authorize a man to sell meat or bread, or keep a restaurant. Men kill others by the careless use of fire-arms, yet we do not exact security of every man who keeps or handles a gun. We make it unlawful for nine tenths of our people to sell liquor—as we would have no right to do if liquor were not a bad thing—and then we license the other portion to sell it as if it were a good thing. The first step toward the enforcement of anti-liquor laws is to make them consistent and logical. We can never stop the unlicensed sale of liquor while we license its sale by some; for there is no moral principle behind such restriction. Who can tell what grog shops are unlicensed? And who very much cares? But let the law make *all* liquor-selling illegal, and *then* we know just who the offenders are."

The Civil War caused a suspension of temperance activity, but upon the revival of the Prohibition issue Mr. Greeley showed that his opinions had undergone no change. In an editorial entitled "Mixed Liquors" in the *Tribune* for Nov. 9, 1867, he said:

"The people of Massachusetts decided, at their late election, that they would discard their present system of liquor Prohibition and try a system of license instead. . . . . We note suggestions that the Prohibitionists may, by uniting with a part of the advocates of license, secure the passage of a stringent Excise act. We presume they might; but we trust they will do nothing of the kind. The sort of muddle termed compromise has a singular fascination for the American mind, and its effects are almost always pernicious. We trust the P. L. L.'s will be allowed to frame and pass just such a liquor law as they approve and are willing to live by. Then, if it have the predicted effect of diminishing dissipation, drunkenness, pauperism and crime, let them have the full credit of it, as they deserve. If the opposite results be realized, let that fact clearly appear, and let judgment be entered accordingly. But let us have no part nor lot in the fabrication of a license law, but give our adversaries unlimited rope."

In an article headed "A question for 'H. G.,'" in the *Tribune* for Nov. 12, 1867, Mr. Greeley quoted as follows from the Boston *Transcript:* "What would be the verdict of history upon a political party that carried the Republic safely through a civil war, and then lost its influence in the nation by attempts to regulate the sale of cider and lager beer?" To this Mr. Greeley replied, in part: "Attempts to *regulate* the sale of alcoholic beverages are exactly what the *Transcript* and its P. L. L. confederates have all along professed to uphold. But mind that attempts to '*regulate*' the liquor traffic are in *your* line, not in ours. *We* believe in cutting that liquor dog's tail off right behind the ears."

Mr. Greeley foresaw the results that would follow the adoption of the system of liquor taxation inaugurated by the Federal Government during the war. Dr. T. S. Lambert, in reminiscences of conversations with Greeley held after the war,[1] quotes him as condemning that system with extreme vigor. According to Dr. Lambert, he charged that the organized liquor power was the direct outgrowth of the revenue laws. In his talks with Dr. Lambert Mr. Greeley also said that at the time when the Internal Revenue bill was pending in Congress an attempt was made by its promotors to win his support by bribery. "For some (to me) unaccountable reason," he said, "I was considered a proper custodian of a promise that I had the right to call, any time within 90 days, for half the profit on 40,000 gallons of whiskey supposed equal to $20,000, all without the least trouble or expense or risk to me; but as I could not stand it to be in the necessity of sleeping every remaining night of my life with a man that I did not respect, I declined in my plainest Saxon, so definite that neither the young man nor my old acquaintance, who introduced him, stopped one moment to argue, or ever spoke to me again, though we often met."

Guthrie, Thomas.—Born in Brechin, Scotland, July 12, 1803, and died in St. Leonard's, Scotland, Feb. 24, 1873. He was educated at Edinburgh University, and in 1825 was licensed to preach. He studied medicine in Paris a little later, and upon his return was employed for some time in his father's banking-house. In 1830 he was ordained as pastor at Arbirlot, where he remained seven years. In 1837 he was called to the pastorate of old Greyfriars' Church in Edinburgh. He was a popular preacher and it was his ambition to reach the poorer classes. For this purpose he opened the old Magdalen Chapel, and gave the poor the preference of the seats. In the disruption of the Church of Scotland in 1843 he united with Dr. Chalmers and others of the Free Church. For some time after the rupture he preached to his congregation in a Methodist chapel. He undertook to open a "ragged school" in the basement of the new church built by his congregation, but the elders opposed the project. He then (1847) published his "Plea for Ragged Schools," and opened a large institution apart from any connection with a denomination or church organization. Other ragged schools were established elsewhere, patterned upon this. Forced to give up public speaking in 1864, he became editor of the *Sunday Magazine*, published at Edinburgh. Dr. Guthrie's active interest in the temperance reform dates from 1840, when, traveling in Ireland, he saw his car-driver refuse to taste whiskey at an inn because he was a teetotaller. "That circumstance," said Dr. Guthrie, "along with the scenes in which I was called to labor daily for years, made me a teetotaller." He lectured often in support of the total abstinence movement, and in 1850 published "A Plea on behalf of Drunkards against Drunkenness." He also advocated the utter suppression of the drink traffic by law. He said:

---

[1] Published in the *Voice* for Dec. 5, 1889.

> "We have cause to thank God for that act of Parliament by which, in answer to the voice of an all but unanimous people, the drinking-shops of Scotland were closed and all traffic in intoxicating liquors pronounced illegal from Saturday night till Monday morning We are not afraid to express our wish that the law of the Sabbath were extended to every day of the week, and all shops opened for the mere purposes of drinking shut—shut up, as a curse to the community, as carrying on a trade, not less than the opium shops of China, incurably pernicious."

Dr. Guthrie published about 20 volumes, composed chiefly of sermons and republished extracts from the *Sunday Magazine* and *Good Words*. Some of the best-known of his works are: "The Gospel in Ezekiel," "The Saint's Inheritance," "The Way to Life," "On the Parables," "Out of Harness," "Speaking to the Heart." "Studies of Character," "Man and the Gospel," and "Our Father's Business." His books, including his "Autibiography and Memoir" by his sons (1874), have been republished in America.

Haddock, George C.—Born at Watertown, N. Y., Jan. 23, 1832, and was murdered at Sioux City, Ia., Aug. 3, 1886. He was descended, on his mother's side, from Lorenzo Dow, the famous preacher. His father was locally known as "the learned blacksmith," having acquired a knowledge of Latin and Greek while working at the forge. George was reared under the best of influences, and he gave his support to the Anti-Slavery and temperance reforms as a matter of course. He was educated at Black River Institute under Prof. Boyd, author of a once popular text-book on Rhetoric. In 1852 he was married and in 1860 began his career as a Methodist Episcopal minister in the Wisconsin Conference. He was outspoken in his pulpit utterances against the drink traffic. In 1873 he was made Presiding Elder of the Fon du Lac district. In 1874, after delivering a temperance lecture at Sheboygan, Wis., he was brutally assaulted by three armed men. He received some heavy blows, but making a vigorous defense drove his assailants into a saloon. He immediately arranged to give another lecture in the same place despite the entreaties of his friends.

He was long dissatisfied with the hostile or indifferent treatment of the temperance question by the old political parties, and as early as 1871 he declared: "For the last ten years I have acted mainly with the Republican party, simply because that party has been right upon questions which then assumed great proportions and demanded immediate settlement. These questions have been settled. I have long since ceased to hope for anything from any party as such until temperance men take such a decided stand as will command respect from the Republican politicians." In 1884 he allied himself with the Prohibition party.

In 1885 he was stationed at Sioux City, Ia., a town with 20,000 inhabitants, 15 churches, and about 100 saloons running in defiance of the State Prohibitory law. The saloon-keepers had threatened to burn the churches if their traffic was interfered with, and no one had the courage to fight them until Mr. Haddock began to arraign them from his pulpit. He signed petitions for prosecutions, lectured in surrounding towns and raised funds for the work in the face of the combined opposition of the city press, the Courts and the rumsellers. He issued a circular entitled "A City in Rebellion," addressed to the pastors of the churches in Sioux City and other towns, in which he described the situation with remarkable force and clearness and asked for financial and moral support. The success of his efforts aroused the liquor men. About 9 o'clock on the evening of Aug. 3, 1886, he procured a horse and buggy from a public stable in Sioux City, and in company with Rev. C. C. Turner drove to Greenville, a neighboring town, to secure evidence in the liquor cases then pending. About an hour later he returned to the stable alone, having left his companion at the latter's home. As he was crossing the street from the stable a crowd of brewers, saloon-keepers and roughs gathered about him, and one of them, John Arensdorf (as the evidence subsequently adduced indicated, in the judgment of most intelligent people), thrust a pistol into the preacher's face and fired a shot. Haddock fell, and he expired almost instantly.

This cold-blooded murder made a profound stir throughout the country. Religious and temperance organizations in every part of the nation held meetings and adopted resolutions. The local authorities in Sioux City, however, were inactive. The municipal government was in the hands of the liquor element, and a considerable time elapsed before Arensdorf and his associates were apprehended. Then the fact was made clear that the murder was the result of a deliberate conspiracy. At a meeting of the Saloon-Keepers' Association of Sioux City, on Aug. 2, plans for "doing up" Haddock and D. W. Wood (a lawyer connected with him in the liquor prosecutions) had been discussed, and Arensdorf had reminded the Association that there was $700 in the treasury, which could be used for rewarding the person doing "the job." The first trial of Arensdorf extended from March 23 to April 17, 1887. The strongest evidence was presented and the Judge before whom the trial was had—C. H. Lewis—was above criticism; but everybody looked with suspicion upon the jury. A verdict of acquittal was prevented only by the conscientious firmness of one of the jurors, J. D. O'Connell, who intimated that the other jurors had been bribed by the defense and that he had been approached by Arensdorf's representatives and requested to name his price. Another trial, held in November and December of 1887, resulted in acquittal. The jury brought in its verdict after a consultation lasting for only 10 minutes; and then the jurors proceeded in a body with the accused murderer to a photographer's and were photographed with Arensdorf in the center. The prosecution's case was even stronger at this second trial than at the first, and in the interval Munchrath, one of the conspirators, had been convicted and lodged in jail. Arensdorf's escape was due to his prominence, to the weight of the influences exercised in his behalf and to the contribution of large sums of money by liquor men who took an interest in securing his acquittal. The other conspirators were ordinary ruffians—den-keepers and desperadoes for whom few cared to interfere. But Arensdorf was identified with the brewing interests; and the brewers of the country, who backed their law-defying brethren in the Prohibition States, recognized that he had a legitimate claim upon them. The United States Brewers' Association, at its annual convention in St. Paul, May 30 and 31, 1888, formally declared, through its Board of Trustees:

> "With great pride and gratification we record the fact that the fanaticism of Iowa Prohibitionists was frustrated in at least one instance, namely, in the attempt to fasten the crime of murder upon Arensdorf, a member of our trade, twice acquitted of complicity in the murder of Dr. Haddock, of which our charitable and highly moral opponents endeavored to convict him at any cost."

The events following the murder of Haddock brought about a reaction against the saloons in Sioux City, and it was not long before the Prohibitory law was completely enforced there. (See PROHIBITION, BENEFITS OF.)

[For further particulars about Haddock, the assassination and the first trial of Arensdorf, see the volume written by his son, Frank C. Haddock, "Hero and Martyr," New York, 1887.]

Hasheesh.—A narcotic preparation made in India, Turkey and other countries of the East from the leaves, flowers, resin and small stalks of the hemp plant. When used an intoxicating effect is produced. Exhilaration, languor, sleep, visions, delirium, hallucinations and catalepsy are among the characteristic results. Enormous quantities of the drug are consumed by the Oriental peoples, and it is estimated that it is in general use among not less than 300,000,000 of the human race. Different varieties of the intoxicating products of hemp are *bhang*, prepared from the stalks and leaves; *ganja*, made from the flowers of the plant, and *charas*, the resinous exudation of the plant. (See INDIA.) It was the custom of Eastern despots, when assigning to servants the duty of assassinating an enemy, to intoxicate them with hasheesh. "When in this state they were introduced into the splendid gardens of the sheikh and surrounded with every sensual pleasure. Such a foretaste of Paradise, only to be granted by their supreme ruler, made them eager to obey his slightest command; their lives they counted as nothing, and would resign them at a word from him."[1] Hence, from "hasheesh," the word "assassin."

Hawkins, John Henry Willis.—Born in Baltimore, Md., Oct. 23, 1799, and died in Parkersburg, Aug. 26, 1858. A confirmed drunkard, he was reformed in 1840 through the efforts of his little daughter, and became the chief apostle of the Washingtonian movement. The "Washingtonians" originated in the conversion into a temperance society in April, 1840, of a Baltimore drinking-club, consisting of six men, who took a pledge not to drink "any spirits or malt liquors, wine, or cider," and called their organization "The Washington Temperance Society." Mr. Hawkins was reformed two months later. He joined the Washingtonians and soon became their most powerful advocate. By the end of the year 1840 the society contained about 700 members, all reformed drinkers. An account of the work, published in the journal of the American Temperance Union by Rev. John Marsh, led to a request from New York temperance men to Mr. Hawkins and some of his co-reformers to visit their city. They did so, addressing a meeting in New York on March 23. Twenty-one meetings followed and 2,000 drinkers signed the pledge, 334 doing so at a single meeting. On April 10 a similar campaign was begun in Boston, resulting in a Washingtonian Society which organized branch societies and carried the movement into 160 towns. Mr. Hawkins and his Baltimore associates travelled through various parts of the country founding societies and securing pledge-signers. By the end of 1841 at least 100,000 pledges had been taken, and more than one-third of them by confirmed drinkers. A weekly newspaper was established as the organ of the movement, and Martha Washington Societies, composed of women, were inaugurated. The order of Sons of Temperance, instituted by 16 persons in New York City, Sept. 29, 1842, was also an offspring of the Washingtonian crusade. Interest in the reform began to decline after 1842, although Mr. Hawkins until his death continued to lecture on temperance, visiting every State in the Union except California. A quarter of a million would be a low estimate of the number of habitual drinkers of intoxicants reclaimed, temporarily at least, through the instrumentality of the Washingtonian agitation. Besides lecturing diligently, Mr. Hawkins contributed freely to the press. A "Life of J. H. W. Hawkins" has been published by his son, William G. Hawkins (Boston, 1859).

Hayes, Lucy Webb, wife of President Hayes; born in Chillicothe, O., Aug. 28, 1831, and died in Fremont, O., June 25, 1889. Her father, a practising physician who served in the War of 1812, died during her infancy. In 1844 her mother removed with her children to Delaware, O., to give them the educational advantages offered by the Ohio Wesleyan University. Girls were not at that time admitted to the regular course of study, but Lucy received instruction from the professors. In 1847 she entered the Wesleyan Female College at Cincinnati, graduating in 1852. In December, 1852, she was married to Rutherford B. Hayes. She was with her husband in the Union Army during the Civil War, and devoted much of her time to the wounded, sick and furloughed soldiers. After the war, until her death, she was an active member of various organized charities. Throughout Mr. Hayes's official life, as Governor of Ohio for three terms, Member of Congress and President of the United States, she, as hostess, dispensed with wines and all alcoholic beverages, not even offering them to guests at public receptions. She was the first lady of the White House to banish intoxicants from the Executive Mansion, although Mrs. Grant had taken some commendable steps, especially in the direction of discouraging the serving of wines at New Year receptions. The rule established by Mrs. Hayes would have occasioned less comment if it had applied exclusively to the private or semi-private life of the President's family; but when extended to ceremonial dinners to foreign ambassadors and other dignitaries it excited wonder, opposition and malignant ridicule. The Secretary of State was particularly strenuous in seeking to persuade Mrs. Hayes that it was an insult to the representatives of foreign nations not to offer them the wines they were accustomed to drink. But she was not swerved from her resolution. "I have young sons who have never tasted liquor," said she, explaining her course; "they shall not receive from my hand or with the sanction that its use in our family would give, their first taste of what might prove their ruin. What I wish for my own sons I must do for the sons of other mothers." In recognition of Mrs. Hayes's attitude the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union placed in the White House (March 7, 1881) a portrait of her, for which she had sat at the Union's request.

---

[1] Encyclopædia Brittanica, article on "Assassins."

Heredity.—The heredity of form and features and the heredity of mental traits and character are unquestioned. The heredity of disease and diseased tendencies may also be observed in every community. Recently it has been shown that criminality, pauperism, insanity, epilepsy and other allied characteristics or tendencies are transmitted, and can be cultivated and grown with as much certainty as plants or animals are bred and changed. Inebriety belongs to the same class, and has been recognized as hereditary for ages. On one of the monuments of Egypt there is a drawing of a drunken father and several drunken children, and the grouping conveys the idea that the inebriety of the parent was the direct cause of the children's disgrace. The references to inebriety and its heredity in both ancient and modern times, by philosophers, physicians and statesmen, would fill a volume; and the briefest presentation of them would furnish a curious and most suggestive chapter of the growth of a great truth. The limits of this article will permit only a general outline of some of the leading facts that are regarded as established by authorities in this field of research.

If the histories of 100 inebriates are studied and compared, the following general truths will be deduced:

Forty per cent. of the 100 will be found to be children of parents who were either excessive or moderate drinkers; many of these parents used wine and beer only at meals, and probably their children shared the beverage with them, while others drank to excess at long intervals.

In 20 per cent. of the cases the inebriety may be traced to the grandparents, more frequently on the mother's than on the father's side, the heredity passing over one generation and appearing in the next. Often with this heredity is found associated the form or features or some of the mental characteristics of the grandparent. The time of the development of the drink impulse may correspond to the age at which the grandparent became a victim. The desire may remain dormant and give no evidence of its presence, then break out suddenly without any apparent exciting cause.

In one case the son of an excellent clergyman whose training and life had been above reproach suddenly began to use spirits at the age of 28, and he died ten years later an inebriate. This was the exact history of his grandfather, whom he resembled closely. In another case a divinity student who had about finished his studies and had been a temperate, model man, coming from an excellent family, all at once became intemperate, ran away to sea as a common sailor, and died a low drunkard some years after. His grandfather, a merchant, had done the same, only at a later period of life. This persistence of hereditary intemperance and its seeming cessation only to appear in the next generation, is apparent in many very curious cases.

The inebriety of another 20 per cent. will be clearly traceable to consumptive, insane, epileptic and feeble-minded ancestors—nerve and brain-exhausted persons. It will be discovered that a certain number of the inebriates of this class had ancestors in whose ages there was considerable disparity. Thus the alcoholic tendency will be stimulated and intensified to a marked degree in the offspring of a young mother whose father was an elderly man and in whose family there was some hereditary disease. Some authorities assert that the union of persons whose ages vary over 20 years will, if one happens to be an inebriate or alcoholic of any kind, always produce insane and inebriate children – children who, as a rule, will become easy victims to delirium and be classed among the criminal inebriates.

The intemperance of the persons making up the remaining 20 per cent. of the 100 inebriates may be attributed to injuries, diseases, shocks, bad nutrition, bad surroundings, physical and mental contagions, etc.

All students agree that fully 80 per cent. of the cases of inebriety are due and traceable, directly or indirectly, to inebriate or diseased ancestors. As already indicated, these cases are divisible into distinct groups.

The so-called *direct heredities* are the commonest. We have seen that fully 40 per cent. of all inebriates inherit their inebriety directly from their parents. In these cases there seems to be transmitted from parent to child some special tendency to use alcohol for relief, or some special taste for alcohol or craving for its effects. The brain and the nervous system appear to be most agreeably influenced by alcohol, and to demand repetitions of the pleasurable excitement. An organic condition is thus established, and the consequences are the creation of an organic memory and a lowering of cell and nerve vigor. The seeming relief that is obtained from alcohol is an organic revelation that is so impressive as to control all future activity. In some instances a single glass of spirits may rouse up diseased impulses and tendencies, setting the brain aflame as a match kindles a pile of combustibles. In other cases each glass may promote a gradual degeneration of cell and nerve tissue, a degeneration that does not reach its consummation until a comparatively long period of time has elapsed. In such cases a special form of degenerative tendency has been transmitted, and alcohol is its peculiar exciting cause. The children of all inebriates, and frequently the children of moderate drinkers, transmit to their offspring certain specific defects of cell and nerve growth, which generally betray themselves in the next generation in the same forms; yet the inherited taint may not be manifested in the first generation of descendants but may reappear in the second one in consequence of some peculiar cause. The person in whom the hereditary tendency is dormant may have an intimation of its presence. Many descendants of inebriate ancestors feel intuitively that they cannot or ought not to use liquor, and hence are abstainers; others, similarly descended, exhibit an intense disgust for alcohol, and others are profoundly indifferent to it. Such individuals abstain without effort, yet their children frequently become passionate lovers of drink. The direction of the alcoholic tendency is most frequently from mother to son and from father to daughter. The father's weakness finds reproduction in the feeble impulses and hysterical character of the daughter, who may not use alcohol, but will be an invalid and drug-taker, and commonly becomes at the end an opium inebriate; while her children (unless she marries a man remarkably free from all hereditary taints) will be inebriates. Her sons will receive legacies of alcoholic tendency and probably die early, and her daughters will be sickly and "defective." A drinking mother, or one who uses wine at meals or spirits in any form for the supposed tonic effects at different periods of life, persistently sows seeds of heredity from which inebriety and its allied diseases will probably grow. A drinking father equally takes the risk of begetting descendants, near or remote, who will be inebriates, criminals and paupers.[1]

If both parents use intoxicants freely,

---

[1] The familiar case of the Jukes family may be again adverted to here. (See p. 142.) The ancestry of this family is traced to Max, a man who was a very hard drinker, and who became blind. Many of his descendants for two generations were also blind, and a multitude of them inherited his intemperance. One of the most notorious of his offspring was a woman named Margaret, of whose progeny Richard L. Dugdale writes: "In tracing the genealogies of 540 persons who descended in seven generations from this degraded woman, and 169 who were related by marriage or cohabitation, 280 were adult paupers, and 140 were criminals and offenders of the worst sort, guilty of seven murders, theft, highway robbery and nearly every other offense known in the calendar of crime." He estimates that the cost to the public of supporting this family of drunkards, criminals and paupers was $1,308,000.

Ribot, in his work on heredity, gives the genealogy of the Chrétien family. John Chrétien, its progenitor (with the taint of robbery in his blood), had three sons, Peter, Thomas and John. Peter had a son named John Francis, who was condemned, for robbery and murder, to hard labor for life. Thomas had two sons, Francis and Martin, who were also condemned for murder, while the son of Martin was transported for highway robbery. John, the third brother, had a son named John Francis, whose wife belonged to a family of incendiaries. To this couple seven children were born, of whom the first was found guilty of seven robberies and died in prison, while the other six (including two daughters) all died in prison, excepting the seventh, who was condemned to death for murder.

the descendants will inevitably be alcoholic consumptives or insane persons, or will have some form of brain and nerve disease. In some cases where alcohol has been prescribed medicinally for a long time as a tonic, especially after exhausting fevers or constitutional diseases, the children begotten will have a very marked alcoholic heredity. There are on record many instances of inebriety in children conceived soon after marriage (when the parents drank wine), although children born to the same parents later in life (when the parents abstained) were temperate. If the parent is intoxicated at the time of conception, the child is likely to be a victim to insanity, inebriety and idiocy. Mothers who indulge in intoxicants freely before the birth and during the lactation of their children impart to them impulses toward inebriety that in after years will obtain mastery if encouraged by circumstances. During the critical periods of life—for example, the period of puberty, the period from 30 to 35 and the period from 40 to 45,—the tendency of persons descended from intemperate ancestors to seek relief in drink is very strong. On the other hand, a subsidence of the drink mania in parents and children at certain periods of life is noted in many cases. Very young infants, the children of hard drinkers, frequently manifest a marked craving for spirits, and cease their cries when a few drops of liquor are administered. It has even been observed that little children have exhibited intense desire at the sight of bottles similar to the ones in which liquors are placed, and would not be satisfied until given alcoholic stimulants. The great variety of very curious developments of the heredity of inebriety is almost bewildering to the student, and establishes not only the general fact that inebriety is a hereditary condition but that it may be reproduced in the descendant under circumstances minutely resembling those witnessed in the case of the progenitor.

A second group of heredities may be called the *indirect*, including cases of families in which, during one or two generations, the inebriety of the ancestor bequeaths minor forms of insanity and various brain and nerve defects, but entails inebriety upon the second or third generation with or without any special exciting cause. In these families, though a particular generation may not be noticeably cursed by the drink crave, all kinds of eccentricities will be betrayed: the individual members will have abnormal mental and physical characteristics, from which brain and nerve diseases will spring and grow rapidly; they will frequently be drug-takers, gourmands, "neurotics," etc.—always on the verge of serious and fatal disorders. In a case that I studied, that of a Hessian soldier, it was necessary to go back for five generations in order to fix the ancestral responsibility for the patient's inebriety. From our present knowledge it is hard to understand why it is that inebriety so often begets only milder allied diseases, which in turn beget virulent types of inebriety which again spend their force in a single generation and give way in later generations to minor ailments; but the facts are too abundant to admit of dispute.

A third group of heredities is made up of *complicated or "borderland" cases*—cases of persons to whose ancestors inebriety cannot be with certainty attributed, but who are found to have been insane, epileptic or consumptive,—criminals or paupers, or in other respects degenerate individuals. A large number of all inebriates belong to this group, and their inebriety is but one outgrowth of the profound degeneration that overtakes and dooms innumerable families. This degeneration may be apparently arrested at times; certain members of the family may betray marked individuality, genius, a high order of emotional sensibility, zeal for an idea, etc. But in succeeding generations insanity, feeble-mindedness, inebriety, consumption, criminality, pauperism, etc., will wreck the heirs of this tainted blood. It is undoubtedly true that even in the most degraded families there is an element of vitality that offers combat to the degenerative principle and achieves temporary triumphs, which are strengthened by intermarriage with families of purer blood; but at best the force of corruption is merely neutralized for a time, and the advantages gained by the degenerate family are more than offset by the injury done to the better one.

With the truth established that a constitutional tendency to inebriety and kindred diseases may be handed down from parent to children and children's children, it is needless to enlarge upon the terrible consequences to posterity that each drinker is engaged in sowing. Observe the direful results to individuals in typical cases of intemperance—the loss of health, character, position, wealth, integrity, morals, means of support and happiness; understand that these results are, in eight cases in ten, visited upon the wretched sufferers because of the conscious or unconscious sins of ancestors, and all will be ready to grant that the evils entailed by drink through the laws of heredity may not be described in words too profuse or too vivid.

T. D. Crothers.

Hewit, Nathaniel.—Born in New London, Conn., Aug. 28, 1788, and died in Bridgeport, Conn., Feb. 3, 1867. He graduated from Yale College in 1808 and began the study of law, but afterward decided to enter the ministry and attended Andover Theological Seminary. Licensed to preach in 1815, he first served the Presbyterian Church at Plattsburg, N. Y. In 1818 he became pastor of the Congregational Church at Fairfield, Conn., resigning in 1828 to become agent for the American Temperance Society, organized at Boston in 1826. Dr. Hewit had already, in 1827, prepared a "Report" of this Society containing 68 pages and giving the resolutions passed by various medical societies regarding the nature and effects of intoxicating drinks and the resolutions of different ecclesiastical bodies. As agent of the American Temperance Society he visited the New England States and some of the Middle States, resigning the position in September, 1830. He has been called the "Luther of the early temperance reform." In 1831 he visited England as the representative of the American Temperance Society, to attend the first public meeting of the London Temperance Society, held in Exeter Hall, June 29, 1831. He addressed the meeting, and it was largely through his exhortations that the London Society changed its name to that of "The British and Foreign Temperance Society," with a view to enlarging its work. After visiting various cities in England and France Dr. Hewit returned to America and became pastor of the 2d Congregational Church at Bridgeport, Conn., and afterwards of a Presbyterian church organized in the same place by his old parishoners, which he continued to serve until compelled by old age and feebleness to resign in 1862.

High License.—The name given to that policy of American liquor legislation whose distinctive feature is the requirement that individual liquor-sellers shall pay relatively large annual fees into the State, municipal or county treasuries. Many of the disinterested advocates of the High License programme insist that the term High License has a wider meaning and also covers accessory restrictions of all kinds—that it is merely a convenient generic name for all "improved" license acts. As a matter of fact, High License provisions are invariably accompanied by certain restrictions or prohibitions governing the manner of sales; but such restrictions and prohibitions are incidental to all license laws, and the High License idea derives its special significance not from the restrictive principle proper (*i. e.*, the principle of absolutely prohibiting sales to certain persons, during certain hours and in certain places), but from the tax or revenue principle (*i. e.*, the principle of taxing the traffic as a "necessary evil"—taxing it up to the maximum attainable point, and drawing from it for the public funds the maximum amount of revenue). The practical distinction between High License and restriction proper will be better understood from this statement: There is no organized opposition among temperance people to efforts for restrictions proper—for Sunday-closing legislation, for the prohibition of sales to minors and drunkards, and at certain hours of the night, for limiting the number of saloons to one for 500 or 1,000 of the population, etc.—because such restrictions viewed by themselves are unconditional prohibitions, which operate (theoretically at least) against all sellers equally and which cannot be lawfully suspended, at any price, for the benefit of particular dealers; on the other hand the High License principle is bitterly antagonized by nearly all the advanced temperance people, because, however disguised, it is nothing else than a recognition of the liquor-dealer's claim that his traffic is entitled to rank with all other species of legitimate traffic provided he pays an imposing fee to the State. In the case of a restriction proper the prohibitory doctrine is suggested, but in the case of a High License provision the idea of sanction for the traffic is dominant. The disposition to look with some favor upon restrictive acts while unsparingly condemning High License is therefore based upon principle first of all.

CLAIMS FOR HIGH LICENSE.

But High License is said to be a restriction in practice—a more effective restriction even (it is claimed) than is the prohibition of sales to minors or any similar provision. For the absolute prohibition of sales to certain persons, at particular hours, etc., when merely incidental to a license policy is very difficult of enforcement, since the public sentiment which consents to indiscriminate license is not likely to insist upon diligent police supervision of the details of the traffic; while, on the other hand, a large increase in the license rate will inevitably reduce the number of saloons and thereby bring the business within narrower limits. That is, incidental prohibitions do not necessarily accomplish their purpose in practice, but a High License provision works automatically, necessarily driving out of the traffic large numbers of dealers who cannot afford to pay the larger fee.

Again, it is urged that High License is the most valuable of restrictions because by diminishing the number of drinking-places it simplifies the problem of police supervision and promotes the ability of the officials to enforce the various prohibitions of the statutes. Therefore it is maintained that High License is the most important instrument for compelling liquor-sellers to respect the concessions made by law to temperance sentiment. Other claims made for this policy are that it will operate to exterminate the most objectionable saloons; that it will confine the traffic to men of responsibility and therefore, presumably, to men of better character; that by diminishing the aggregate number of liquor-dealers it will diminish the temptations to the drinker and consequently reduce the consumption of drink; that it will remove from political warfare the organized power of the more dangerous, demonstrative, ignorant and offensive rum element that is seen in active and constant operation so long as the laws bestow upon it the right to exist; that by entrusting a comparatively few responsible men, under rigid conditions, with the privilege of selling liquor—that privilege to be purchased at a high money price and to be cancelled in case of violations of the law,—the co-operation of these privileged licensees will be commanded by the authorities in their efforts to enforce wholesome restrictions and to suppress unlicensed establishments; that the first restriction of the liquor traffic by High License will make it comparatively easy to bring about a second and greater restriction, to be followed in time by more radical restrictions until the whole traffic is "taxed to death" and thus extinguished by progressive action instead of by a sudden (and not necessarily permanent) sentimental decree; that, meanwhile, the liquor traffic will be under the severest stigma attaching to any trade, and be pronounced by law to be so dangerous to the community as to require restriction at all points and the payment of enormous sums to the Government; and that the larger revenue will in a more satisfactory degree compensate the public for the evils resulting from the traffic.

HISTORICAL REVIEW.

The High License plan was not urged with any activity in the early years of the temperance agitation. This fact seems remarkable when it is remembered that the Prohibitory movement was successful (nominally at least) in more States during the decade 1850-60 than it has been in the three decades since 1860. But the ingenuity of conservative people was not then fully developed. The proposition that the traffic was either right or wrong, and should be suppressed wholly or permitted to continue under comparatively normal conditions, was then more willingly accepted. The Prohibitory system, where adopted, was not regarded as necessarily permanent, but as distinctively experimental, to be abandoned unconditionally if not strong enough to hold its own. The willingness of liquor-dealers to pay heavy license charges rather than cease selling was not then apparent. At the time of the Prohibition agitation in New York, the annual saloon license fee in the chief city of that State was only $10. A law fixing a yearly rate of $500 or $1,000 would probably have been considered a greater innovation than entire Prohibition. The Federal Government had not then set an example to the States. There was no large tax upon the production of liquors; a man could engage in the traffic in any of its branches with but little capital; the organized liquor power as it is known to-day had not been created.

The High License movement, as a feature of the temperance agitation, came into existence at about the same time that the Constitutional Prohibition idea attained prominence. Preparation for it had been made by a gradual raising of the license rates in many States. Up to 1880, however, a rate of $200 per year was considered high. The High License crusade dates from the enactment of the Nebraska "Slocumb" law in February, 1881. It fixed minimum annual fees of $500 for saloons in all towns having less than 10,000 population, and $1,000 in those containing more than 10,000 inhabitants, and established numerous restrictions of a very rigid nature. The enactment of the Downing law of Missouri followed in March, 1883, fixing the yearly license charges at $50 to $200 for State purposes, and $500 to $800 for county purposes—a minimum of $550 and a maximum of $1,000. In the same year (in June) the Illinois Legislature passed the Harper law, under which minimum rates of $500 for the sale of all kinds of liquors and $150 for the sale of malt liquors only were fixed. Since then many of the other license States have required the saloon-keepers to pay relatively large sums—notably Massachusetts, where the minimum license rate for the ordinary saloon selling all kinds of liquors for consumption on and off the premises is now $1,300 per year; Minnesota, where the minimum rates are $500 for towns and $1,000 for cities; Pennsylvania, where the uniform rate for each city is $500; the new State of Montana, where $500 is charged in towns having 3,500 inhabitants or more; the Territory of Utah, where the minimum charge is $600 and the maximum $1,200, and several Southern States like Arkansas, Texas and West Virginia, where the aggregate fees exacted range from $500 upward. (For the license provisions prevailing in the various States, see LEGISLATION.)

The first High License legislation undeniably originated with thoroughly radical temperance men, believers in the principle of Prohibition, who honestly thought they were making a serious attack upon the traffic. The framers of the Nebraska act were John B. Finch, H. W. Hardy and other temperance leaders equally earnest. The Missouri law was passed as a compromise measure, to defeat the Prohibitory bill pressed by John A. Brooks and his aggressive followers, but it was looked upon by many as an important step in the direction of Prohibition. In Illinois the Harper law was also welcomed by advanced men. "When our Illinois Legislature adopted the High License law," writes Samuel W. Packard of Chicago, "I was greatly rejoiced. I thought it was a long step towards Prohibition. I tried to get up a celebration over the great victory for temperance, and offered to contribute $10 towards fireworks for the occasion."[1] Similar gratification and confidence have been expressed by temperance leaders upon the enactment of High License in other States. Very moderate measures have called forth encomiums from some of the foremost friends of Prohibition: for instance, the Scott law of Ohio, fixing the maximum saloon tax at $200 per year for places selling all sorts of liquors, and $100 per year for those selling beer and wine exclusively, was commended in the warmest terms by Dr. Theodore L. Cuyler. (See p.107.) It was several years before the High License programme was regarded with decided suspicion by the Prohibitionists, but by 1886 a general distrust was felt, and ever since then active hostility has been manifested. Opposition to High License is now as much a part of the Prohibition creed as opposition to the saloon itself.

PROHIBITION OPPOSITION — TEST QUESTIONS.

In justification of this antagonism the Prohibitionists, besides declaring that High License in principle is simply a variation of the license idea with which they are at war, present an indictment against the policy on practical grounds that seems to be conclusive. This indictment contradicts every claim made by High License advocates, save only the claims that a reduction in the number of saloons will be effected by an honest trial of their programme, and that an increase in the revenue from the traffic will be gained. High License legislation is shown to have no genuine temperance value and to be incapable, even under the most favorable circumstances, of producing encouraging temperance results. And it is not a failure merely in the sense that restrictions proper are failures; it is condemned as an obstructive device, more dangerous than any other compromise yet tried, and the most effective policy that can possibly be resorted to by the forces that seek to defeat or defer Prohibition.

---

[1] The *Voice*, Jan. 19, 1888.

Any statistical inquiry concerning the fruits of High License experiments from the temperance point of view must be based on certain test questions like these: Has the number of arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct been reduced, or is that number comparatively smaller in High License communities than in communities where low rates of license prevail? How do the total numbers of arrests for all causes compare in High License and low license communities? Is there any evidence that the quantity of liquor consumed has been diminished under High License? No satisfactory inquiry has been conducted under official auspices, but private investigators have amassed a great deal of testimony that stands unchallenged. The most important evidence is that printed by the *Voice*, of which we present some of the main features.

In 1889 the *Voice* sent letters to the police and other officials of every important city of the United States in which the annual saloon license fee during 1888 was (1) in excess of $500 or (2) under $200. Statistics sufficiently complete to justify classification were received from 41 of the High License cities and 38 of the low license cities. Every report was treated with perfect impartiality. In the following table the *Voice's* figures of arrests and license fees for 1888 are copied, but the population returns are for the year 1890, specially obtained from the Census Bureau in February, 1891.

CITY.	Population, 1890. Official and Semi-Official.	Annual License Fee of Ordinary Saloon, 1888.	Number of Saloons, 1888.	Population to One Saloon.	Total Number of Arrests.	Arrests for Drunkenness and Disorderly Conduct.	Number of Population to One Arrest for Drunkenness and Disorderly Conduct.	Per Cent. of Arrests for Drunkenness and Disorderly Conduct to Total Arrests.
High License Cities.								
Little Rock, Ark.	(a) 25,133	$1,000	45	559	2,932	1,099	23	37
Joliet, Ill.	(a) 27,407	1,000	54	508	1,760	1,158	24	66
Rockford, Ill.	(a) 23,584	1,000	26	907	401 [1]	305 [1]	77	76
Minneapolis, Minn.	(a) 164,738	1,000	248	664	6,039	3,408	48	56
St. Paul, Minn.	(a) 133,156	1,000	360	370	6,862	3,493	38	51
Hastings, Neb.	(a) 13,793	1,000	13	1,061	353 [2]	150	92	43
Lincoln, Neb.	(a) 55,491	1,000	32	1,734	1,876	752	74	40
Omaha, Neb.	(a) 139,526	1,000	250	558	12,543 [3]	2,955 [3]	47	23
New Bedford, Mass.	(b) 40,733	1,000	96	424	1,345	1,006	40	73
Kansas City, Mo.	(b) 132,716	900	500	265	6,767	2,308	58	34
St. Joseph, Mo.	(a) 52,811	850	130	406	3,909	1,540	34	39
North Adams, Mass.	(b) 16,074	800	20	804	642	419	38	65
Salem, Mass.	(b) 30,801	750	34	906	1,540	1,180	26	77
Worcester, Mass.	(b) 84,655	750	81	1,045	4,241	3,284	26	77
San Antonio, Tex.	(a) 38,681	650	150	258	2,725 [1]	1,227 [1]	32	45
Aurora, Ill.	(a) 19,634	625	38	517	307	190	103	62
Dallas, Tex.	(a) 38,140	600	100	381	3,721 [1]	1,634 [1]	23	44
Los Angeles, Cal.	(b) 50,395	600	210	238	5,579	1,853	27	33
Lowell, Mass.	(b) 77,696	600	217	358	4,150	3,065	25	74
Bloomington, Ill.	(a) 22,242	600	52	428	1,116	608	37	54
St. Louis, Mo.	(b) 451,770	550	1,800	251	17,987	8,467	53	47
Leadville, Col.	(a) 11,159	500	72	155	2,058	1,547	7	75
Columbus, Ga.	(a) 18,650	500	41	455	2,062	1,375	14	67
Chicago, Ill.	(b) 1,099,850	500	4,200	262	50,432	31,164	35	62
East St. Louis, Ill.	(a) 15,156	500	100	152	1,573	648	23	41
Quincey, Ill.	(a) 31,478	500	116	270	808	510	61	63
Rock Island, Ill.	(a) 13,596	500	57	239	417	207	66	50
Springfield, Ill.	(a) 24,852	500	115	216	3,233	1,351	18	42
Faribault, Minn.	(a) 6,524	500	14	466	78	39	167	50
Rochester, Minn.	(a) 5,321	500	11	484	62	26	205	42
Bay City, Mich.	(a) 27,826	500	141	197	972	523	53	54
Detroit, Mich.	(a) 205,669	500	1,000	206	9,142	5,396	38	59
East Saginaw, Mich.	(c) 30,000	500	171	175	1,671	779	39	47
Grand Rapids, Mich.	(a) 64,147	510	143	449	1,787	1,046	61	60
Jackson, Mich.	(a) 20,779	500	60	346	876	478	43	55
Muskegon, Mich.	(a) 22,668	500	62	366	466	362	63	78
Port Huron, Mich.	(a) 13,519	500	48	282	957	308	44	32
Springfield, Mass.	(b) 44,179	500	36	1,227	2,084	1,478	30	71

City.	Population, 1890, Official and Semi-Official.	Annual License Fee of Ordinary Saloon, 1888.	Number of Saloons, 1888.	Population to One Saloon.	Total Number of Arrests.	Arrests for Drunkenness and Disorderly Conduct.	Number of Population to One Arrest for Drunkenness and Disorderly Conduct.	Per Cent. of Arrests for Drunkenness and Disorderly Conduct to Total Arrests.
High License Cities.								
Allegheny, Pa..	(b) 105,287	$500	78	1,350	3,042	2,026	52	68
Philadelphia, Pa........	(b) 1,046,964	500	1,340	781	46,899	31,837	33	68
Parkersburg, W. Va....	(a) 8,389	500	34	247	768	616	14	80
Low License Cities.								
Savannah, Ga	(a) 41,762	200	265	158	2,157	979	43	45
Indianapolis, Ind.......	(a) 107,445	200	360	298	3,972	1,198	90	30
Charleston, S. C........	(a) 54,592	200	271	201	3,210	1,296	42	40
Fon Du Lac, Wis.......	(b) 12,024	200	54	223	149 [4]	91	132	61
La Crosse, Wis	(b) 25,090	200	144	174	2,375	623	40	26
Madison, Wis..........	(b) 13,426	200	70	192	293	142	95	48
Milwaukee, Wis........	(b) 204,468	200	1,198	171	4,346	3,023	68	69
Oshkosh, Wis..........	(b) 22,836	200	85	269	1,376	286	80	21
Racine, Wis............	(b) 21,014	200	85	247	129	82	256	64
Lynchburg, Va.........	(a) 19,779	200	66	300	2,575	560	35	22
New York City.........	(b) 1,515,301	200	7,809	194	85,049	46,174	33	54
Virginia, Nev..........	(a) 6,337	184	50	127	262	180	35	69
Richmond, Va..........	(a) 80,838	[5] 180	314	257	6,290	2,225	36	35
Ogdensburg, N. Y......	(a) 11,667	150	39	299	116	43	271	37
Oswego, N. Y	(a) 21,826	150	150	146	736	512	43	69
Watertown, N. Y.... ..	(a) 14,733	150	38	388	352	222	66	63
Norristown, Pa.........	(a) 19,750	150	34	581	409	252	78	61
Auburn, N. Y	(a) 25,887	135	111	233	1,142	702	37	61
Buffalo, N. Y..........	(a) 254,457	125	1,850	138	14,149	7,584	34	53
Poughkeepsie, N. Y....	(a) 22,836	125	130	176	462	226	100	49
Wilmington, Del. ..	(a) 61,437	100	200	307	2,019 [6]	1,105 [6]	56	55
Lexington, Ky..........	(a) 22,355	100	85	263	2,322	764	29	33
Brooklyn, N. Y....	(b) 806,343	100	3,164	255	31,124	16,112	50	51
San Francisco, Cal.....	(b) 298,997	84	3,000	100	19,466	10,508	28	54
Binghamton, N. Y......	(a) 35,093	[5] 90	99	354	725	621	57	86
Schenectady, N. Y......	(a) 19,857	75	120	165	708	366	54	51
Baltimore, Md	(b) 434,439	50	2,860	152	29,789	18,949	23	64
Cumberland, Md.......	(a 10,030	50	58	173	770	655	15	85
Long Island City, N. Y.	(a) 30,396	50	216	141	1,256	380	80	30
Rochester, N. Y........	(a) 138,327	50	926	149	4,204	1,356	102	33
Rome, N. Y............	(a) 14,980	50	100	150	165	110	136	66
Utica, N. Y....	(a) 44,001	50	380	116	1,520	540	81	36
Yonkers, N. Y..........	(a) 31,945	50	101	316	509	389	82	76
Martinsburg, W. Va....	(a) 7,207	50	19	379	97	39	185	40
Elmira, N. Y...........	(a) 28,070	45	218	129	1,830	1,087	26	59
Cohoes, N. Y....	(a) 22,432	40	200	112	626	312	72	50
Troy, N. Y	(a) 60,605	30	720	84	2,531	1,356	45	54
Covington, Ky..........	(a) 37,375	25	194	193	1,667	1,130	33	67
Summary.		*Average License.*						
41 High License Cities.	4,455,189	$665.	12,295	362	216,132	121,877	36.6	56
38 Low License Cities.	4,599,957	122.	25,783	179	230,877	122,179	37.6	52

[1] Figures for 1887. [2] Including 105 so-called "arrests" of prostitutes. [3] Including 2,701 so-called "arrests" of prostitutes. [4] Does not include 678 vagrants and tramps. [5] Approximate. [6] Nine months' record. [7] The figures of arrests for disorderly conduct in Omaha do not include 1,113 for "disturbing the peace by fighting," 484 "suspicious characters," 62 "using obscene language," 2,608 "vagrants" or other similar arrests usually classified with "disorderly." In order to be strictly fair to High License Omaha, we have not counted these offenses, although they should undoubtedly be counted.

(a) First counts, and therefore semi-official. (b) Official. (c) Estimated.

The following deductions are drawn from the table :

1. The license fee is five times as great in the 41 High License cities as in the 38 low license cities, and the number of saloons is only about one-third as great.

2. Yet there is but very little difference in the number of arrests in ratio to population in the High License and the low license cities.

3. The ratio of arrests for drunkenness and disorder to the total arrests is noticeably greater in the High License than in the low license cities.

The conclusions thus reached are confirmatory of those derived from similar investigations, on a narrower scale, formerly made by the *Voice*. (See "The Political Prohibitionist for 1887," p. 59, and for 1889, p. 60.)

Separate comparisons of particular High License cities with particular low license cities might be made, showing very unfavorably for High License. But the table given above meets all the purposes of such individual comparisons and it is far more satisfactory to the student than any number of single instances would be, since it has a wide range and justifies general statements.

But there is another very important branch of investigation. It is desirable not merely to compare conditions in one city with those in another, but to ascertain the comparative conditions resulting from the High License and low license policies respectively, operating in different years in the same city. What have been the practical consequences of changes from low license to High License in typical American communities? Do not the statistics of arrests for drunkenness and crime show that such changes have been for the better? These questions must be candidly answered by patiently searching the records of a large number of cities, before the final verdict on the High License system can fairly be made up.

A GENERAL SURVEY.

From Nebraska, the oldest of the High License States, the testimony is practically unanimous that there is more drunkenness and crime in proportion to the population now, after nine years' trial of the $1,000 law, than there ever was under low license. Unfortunately it is all but impossible to secure reliable police records of arrests for drunkenness, etc., for any year of the low license period. But conditions must have been frightful indeed if the evils of the liquor traffic in the Nebraska towns were greater then than they are now. For example, in Omaha (see the above table) there was one arrest in 1888 for every 11 of the population; and even omitting the 2,701 so-called "arrests" of prostitutes in Omaha in that year, there was one arrest for every 14 of the population—a ratio more appalling than that found in any other great American city. The complete failure of High License in Nebraska will be alluded to more particularly in another part of this article.

Missouri, which adopted High License in 1883, has had a similar experience. In the city of St. Louis during the last year of low license ($85) there were 1,800 saloons, 3,500 arrests for drunkenness and 14,000 arrests for all causes; while in 1887 the license fee was $559, there were about 1,700 saloons, and the number of arrests for drunkenness was 4,112, and for all causes 15,217. In St. Joseph during the last full year of low license the license fee was $150 and there were 1,935 arrests, of which 465 were for drunkenness; while during the first full year of High License (April, 1884, to April, 1885) the license fee was $750 and there were 2,141 arrests, of which 612 were for drunkenness.

The cities of the State of Illinois present records that are uniformly discouraging to the High License advocates. The following are the figures for Chicago:

Year.	Saloon License Fee.	Total Arrests.	Arrests for Drunkenness and Disorderly Conduct.	Arrests of Minors.
1880	$52	28,480	.....	6,144
1881	52	31,713	.....	6,753
1882	52	32,800	.....	7,199
1883	103	37,187	18,045	6,675
1884	150–500[1]	39,434	21,416	6,718
1885	150–500[1]	40,998	23,080	6,550
1886	500	44,261	25,407	6,841
1887	500	46,505	26,067	7,539
1888	500	50,432	31,164	8,923

[1] $150 for beer and $500 for strong liquors.

The last year before the $500 license fee went into effect was 1883; comparing the figures for 1888 with the figures for 1883, it is seen that the license fee increased 400 per cent., the total arrests increased 35.6 per cent., the arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct increased 72.7 per cent. and the arrests of minors increased 33.7 per cent. (although special efforts were made by the Citizens' League to keep the boys out of the saloons). The other cities of Illinois show results quite as striking. In Joliet and Rockford, where the annual license rate has been $1,000, crime and intemperance have steadily increased.[1]

Passing by many other examples, we dismiss this branch of the statistical inquiry with a glance at the High License cities of Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. In the former State at the beginning of the license year in 1889 (May 1) two extraordinary statutes went into effect: one limited the number of saloons to one for each 500 of the population in Boston and each 1,000 of the population in every other community; and the other fixed a minimum annual license rate of $1,000 for saloons selling all kinds of liquors for consumption on the premises and an additional $300 for those selling also for consumption off the premises—so that the minimum annual license rate for the ordinary saloon in Massachusetts became $1,300 on the 1st of May, 1889. The average rate prevailing previously to that date was not in excess of $350, although in some cities $400 and larger sums were charged. But in practically all the cities granting licenses in May, 1889, there was a noticeable increase in arrests. In Boston, although there were only 780 licenses granted in 1889 as against 1,545 in 1888, the arrests for drunkenness numbered 5,999 during May, June and July of 1889, as against only 5,261 during the same months of 1888. In Lynn the number of saloons decreased from 120 in 1888 to 46 in 1889, yet the arrests for drunkenness increased from 444 during May, June and July of 1888 to 517 during the same months of 1889. In Lowell the license fee for the ordinary saloon was $500 in 1888 and $1,400 in 1889, while only 62 licenses were issued in 1889 as against 240 in 1888; yet the arrests for drunkenness were 1,348 in the four months of May, June, July and August, 1889, as against only 1,204 in the same months of 1888.[1]

---

[1] See "The Political Prohibitionist for 1889," pp. 58, 62.

THE CASE OF PHILADELPHIA.

All this convincing testimony against High License as a temperance measure has been ignored by the advocates of the policy. When asked to present facts in demonstration of its practical benefits, they have merely cited figures showing a decrease in the number of saloons and an increase in the revenue. No attempt has been made to prove that High License has checked intemperance and crime, save only for the city of Philadelphia. The Brooks law went into operation in that city June 1, 1888. The number of liquor licenses was immediately reduced from 5,773 in 1888 to 1,347; and during the five months of June, July, August, September and October, 1888, the number of commitments to the County Prison was only 8,455, as against 13,554 in the same months of 1887; while the number of commitments to the House of Correction in the same months showed a decrease from 2,663 in 1887 to 1,823 in 1888. It was claimed that this very large reduction was due to the High License feature of the Brooks law. But the license rate fixed by this law was only $500; and experience in other cities had provided no justification for attributing Philadelphia's temperance results to the increased license fee. In fact, these results came wholly from other causes: the Brooks law established a new licensing system for Philadelphia, taking the licensing power out of the control of the corrupt political board that had formerly exercised it and placing it in the hands of the Court of Quarter Sessions. This Court manifested great severity; and although more than 3,000 applicants stood ready to pay the $500 license fee, only 1,347 licenses were granted. The Judges of the Court were exceptionally aggressive and honorable men, and it was well known to the liquor-dealers that their licenses would not be continued if the restrictions of the law were not respected. These peculiar circumstances explain the brief improvement in Philadelphia from the temperance point of view. The record of decreased commitments was not maintained, the figures for the year 1889 showing that crime was again on the increase. The brewers of Philadelphia are more prosperous than they were under the low license law; for the year ending June 30, 1890, the sales of beer in that city aggregated 1,458,846 barrels, as against 1,409,478 barrels for the year ending June 30, 1888, the last year of low license.[2] The most prominent temperance leaders, men who had originated the restrictions of the Brooks law, united in declaring that the High License provision had nothing to do with the decrease in the arrests.[1] And there was no such decrease in any other city of Pennsylvania. The traffic in the cities of Pittsburgh and Allegheny was revolutionized in precisely the same way as the traffic in Philadelphia had been; the licensing power was taken from a political board and given to the Courts, and Judge White, who presided at the licensing session, was even more stringent than the Philadelphia Judges. Under his administration the number of licenses in Allegheny County (embracing Pittsburgh and Allegheny) was reduced from 2,185 in 1887 to 525 in 1888: yet arrests for drunkenness and crime in the two cities in 1888 showed a decided increase. As for the other cities of Pennsylvania, the Brooks law was attended with no beneficial results in any of them.[2]

---

[1] For statistics for other license cities of Massachusetts, telling with equal force against High License, see the *Voice* for Sept. 12 and Oct. 31, 1889.

The *Voice* made a still more thorough presentation of Massachusetts police statistics in its issue for April 3, 1890. But this presentation is not so valuable as the others, since the figures for 1889 are figures for the *police* year which terminated (in most cities) on Jan. 31, 1889, and not for the *license* year which terminated (in all cities) on April 30, 1890; therefore the figures for the year 1889 given by the *Voice* represent, at the most, only eight months of the first year of High License in Massachusetts. Besides, the figures under the heads "License Fee" and "Number of Saloons" are not properly computed in all cases in this table. But the statistics (official in every case) of arrests for all offenses and arrests for drunkenness, are of great interest; they show that during the police year 1889 (including eight months under the new High License law), the arrests for drunkenness and crime were in nearly all cases more numerous than during the low license years 1886, 1887 and 1888. For instance, the totals for Boston were: *Arrests for all offenses*—1886 (low license), 28,510; 1887 (low license), 30,681; 1888 (low license), 36,009; 1889 (eight months High License), 40,066; *Arrests for drunkenness*—1886, 16,179; 1887, 19,141; 1888, 23,044; 1889, 24,991. The totals for Lowell were: *Arrests for all offenses*—1886, 3,393; 1887, 3,484; 1888, 4,150; 1889, 4,557; *Arrests for drunkenness*—1886, 2,220; 1887, 2,501; 1888, 2,930; 1889, 3,307. And the figures for Fall River, Lynn, Lawrence, Springfield and other cities were of the same general character.

[2] The *Brewers' Journal* for July, 1890.

In making statistical comparisons we have purposely contrasted High License systems with low license systems exclusively,[3] in order to discover whether High License has any advantages over low license on temperance grounds. Low license is confessedly an inefficient temperance policy; nobody claims that in a community where licenses are granted without discrimination the evils of the liquor traffic will be comparatively slight; everybody admits that in such a community these evils will be appalling. High License is championed solely upon the theory that it will be a somewhat better temperance policy than low license. We have seen that this theory is fallacious if official statistics are to be regarded as conclusive. High License laws, even the most rigid, have not checked arrests for intemperance, disorder and crime: that proposition admits of no dispute.

But if it is urged that the different claims for High License noticed at the beginning of this article should be subjected to other tests, no difficulty will be experienced in reviewing them from any standpoint that may be suggested to the practical mind. Testimony of unquestioned authority is abundant.

TESTIMONY FROM THE CLERGYMEN AND OTHERS.

The testimony of the persons most profoundly and most conscientiously interested in the advancement of temperance reform should first be consulted—the testimony of the religious element and of the temperance leaders and organizations. Exhaustive inquiries as to the effects of the Nebraska law have recently been made among the Nebraska clergy. In 1890 the *Voice* sent a series of questions to the ministers of that State, including the following:

> "After an experience of nine years of High License in Nebraska, how, in your opinion, can the power of the saloon be most readily broken and its influence for evil destroyed—by continuing the license system and making it mandatory in all parts of the State, or by prohibiting the saloon by law?"

Replies were received from 285 clergymen, among whom there were 142 Methodist Episcopalians, 17 Baptists, 15 Presbyterians, 19 Congregationalists, 3 United Brethren pastors, 4 Protestant Episcopalians, 12 Lutherans, 2 Roman Catholics and 4 Christians; while 67 were affiliated with other denominations. Of these 285 clergymen, 276 answered that observation and experience induced them to believe that High License had failed in Nebraska and Prohibition would be a better policy.[4] Similar investigations have produced similar results. In 1888 Rev. G. H. Prentice of Gilbertsville, N. Y., addressed a number of inquiries, covering the whole ground of the claims made by the advocates of High License, to many Nebraska pastors. The replies, with scarcely an exception, "denounced the law with extraordinary vehemence, declaring it to be worse than worthless as a temperance measure and the strongest possible barrier to the advancement of Prohibition."[5] Representative religious denominations of Nebraska, at their State meetings, frequently condemn the High License law explicitly, or, by declaring for Prohibition as the only acceptable policy, intimate their condemnation of it. The Nebraska Baptist Convention declared, Nov. 2, 1888:

---

[1] See the letter of Joshua L. Baily in the *Voice* for Jan. 31, 1889, and the interview with Lewis D. Vail in the *Voice* for Oct. 31, 1889.

[2] See "The Political Prohibitionist for 1889," p. 64.

[3] For an examination of the comparative results of High License and Prohibitory laws, see PROHIBITION, BENEFITS OF.

[4] See the *Voice* for March 13, June 12 and June 19, 1890.

[5] Political Prohibitionist for 1890, p. 60.

"We condemn the High License system of Nebraska as morally wrong and a compromise with the powers of darkness, under which the liquor traffic has been fostered and developed until it has become a united and mighty power of evil and a controlling influence in the politics and legislation of our State."

The Nebraska Presbyterian Synod in 1888 declared:

"We have no faith in compromise, no faith in license, high or low. In the name of God and humanity, we demand that the saloon be made an outlaw in the State and in the nation. We want no fellowship with the 'unfruitful works of darkness.' We want no blood money to pay our taxes and to educate our children. We want no legal enactment to protect this national nuisance from the vengeance of an outraged people."

The Methodist Episcopal Conference of Nebraska in 1888 declared:

"That we will adhere to and support only that party which is entirely committed to the principle that the 'complete legal Prohibition of the traffic in alcoholic drinks is the duty of civil government.' We cannot be induced to deviate from this position."

The temperance leaders of Nebraska who took so active a part in framing the High License act unite in pronouncing it an absolute failure in practice. John B. Finch said in 1885:

"I now know I was terribly mistaken in my theories. Many of the delusions urged in defense of High License have been exploded by the trial of the law."[1]

H. W. Hardy, known as the "father of High License," has said:

"High License does increase the number of unlicensed drinking-places. The last time we had access to the Internal Revenue Collector's books (he won't let us see them lately), there were 91 persons in Omaha and 17 in Lincoln who held a Government permit without the sign of a city or State license. Of course they were selling liquor, or why did they pay for a Government permit? They are not afraid of local authorities, but do not dare to monkey with the Government. We never knew one liquor dealer to complain of another. They all live in glass houses of violated law, and throwing stones would be dangerous. Some parts of the State are even worse than the cities I have mentioned. It does not lessen the number of open saloons. If ten are making clear $1,000 each and you tax each of them $1,000, it would leave them no profits at all; but if four dropped out, or went into partnership with four others, then they could pay $6,000 and make money again; for they save the expense of running four saloons and have all the trade the ten did. It does not lessen the drinks or the curse, but heavily increases them. After a man pays $1,000 he pushes things the best he knows how. It procrastinates Prohibition ten years. It is a whiskey devil in temperance garb. We were deceived by it, or Nebraska would have Prohibition today. The money serves as a bribe. In Omaha it is $32 for every voter. Praying church members vote for it just for the money. They are willing to let their boys slide rather than miss the money. At first the liquor men fought against it, now they all fight for it. Put on restrictions but don't take their money. A virtuous woman may be deceived and betrayed, but when she deliberately sells her virtue for money, what is she? It is selling boys for drunkards, and girls for drunkards' wives.

"There is now no longer any excuse for being deceived as we were. The fraud has been tested and found wanting. I was first elected Mayor [of Lincoln] in 1877, and again reelected at the close of my first term. I thought at the time I had done a good thing to reduce the number of saloons from 22 to five, but when I found it did not lessen the curse I saw my mistake. There are just as many stabbings, shootings and pounded noses as ever there were, just as many broken homes, crying wives and ragged children. It is no great consolation to a houseless, hungry, crying wife to tell her that her husband got drunk on High License whiskey. High License is one of the devil's best devices to deceive good temperance people. Then to think I was his first agent on earth to start it! Don't you think I ought to do something to atone for such conduct?"[2]

SEDUCTIVE INFLUENCES OF THE HIGH LICENSE IDEA.

In the other States that have tried High License, all the advanced temperance workers and most of the clergymen denounce it with equal bitterness. They have looked in vain for beneficial effects, and they have found High License to be the most objectionable form of compromise legislation, since the plausible arguments in its behalf deceive multitudes of men who would otherwise favor more radical measures, while the large revenue that it brings to the public funds seduces other multitudes. Care is taken, by the artful framers of High License acts, to appeal irresistibly to local selfishness by providing that the largest part of the resulting revenue shall be retained in the municipality or county where raised. Of all the struggles made for Constitutional Prohibition, the most unsuccessful ones have been those conducted in High License States, because the masses of the people are loth to surrender an immense revenue, and, not paying careful attention to all the arguments and evidence, are unable to attach due weight to the considerations against High License.

---

[1] The *Voice*, Nov. 12, 1885.

[2] Political Prohibitionist for 1889, p. 60.

The seductive influence that this doctrine has with the masses will be better appreciated when its influence with important elements of the clergy and even with some persons identified with the temperance movement is considered. The Protestant Episcopal Church is practically committed to it, and the Temperance Society of this church is one of the most active promoters of it. The most eminent leaders of the Roman Catholic Church prefer High License as a legislative policy, and the most distinguished total abstinence advocate among the Catholics, Archbishop Ireland, while favoring Prohibition under certain circumstances, and always speaking against the saloon with great boldness, is an avowed High License man. In the other denominations there are highly influential divines who have stood by High License through all the controversy ; the well-known Presbyterian, Dr. Howard Crosby, is foremost among these champions ; and many other clergymen, either by outspoken action or by significant silence, lend respectability to the High License policy. Some of the most important religious weeklies treat the policy with manifest tolerance. And outside the church, even among those who are regarded as temperance specialists, occasional supporters of High License are found. Francis Murphy, the prominent gospel temperance orator, and ex-Judge Noah Davis, whose devotion to the anti-saloon cause is undoubted, are leading representatives of this class of sympathizers. The examples of such men naturally confuse the minds of the public and are responsible for much of the strength of the High License movement. Yet the testimony of the clergy and temperance leaders to which we have alluded is in no wise weakened by the circumstance of exceptions. This testimony relates facts that have never been disputed. The men who cling to the High License idea justify themselves by ingenious arguments and various excuses. They maintain that under certain present circumstances Prohibition cannot be or will not be enforced, and therefore they propose the alternative scheme of High License. But they have no evidence to offer in proof of the practical value of their plan.

TESTIMONY OF THE PRESS.

The testimony against High License so aggressively presented by nearly all the active supporters of the temperance agitation is discredited by some on the score that it comes from prejudiced sources, from Prohibition partisans. No such criticism can be urged against the deliberate comments of representative daily newspapers. No fact is better understood than that the great dailies of the United States are very loth to offer encouragement to the Prohibitionists or to assault compromise liquor legislation. When a formal attack on High License, upon temperance grounds, is made by an important daily journal, it may almost be said to have the weight of a judicial opinion.

The Chicago *Daily News* (Ind.) printed this remarkable declaration in its issue for April 9, 1888:

> "We have had High License [$500] in Illinois for five years, and while it is a success as a revenue measure, it is an undisguised failure as a temperance measure. It in no way checks the consumption of intoxicating liquors as a beverage nor does it in the least degree lessen the evils or crime from such use. . . . . The dives and dens, the barrel-houses and thieves' resorts, are as bad and as frequent in this city to-day, after five years of High License, as they ever were. Call High License what it is, an easy way to raise a revenue from vice, but let there be an end of endorsing it as a temperance or reform measure."

The Chicago *Daily Times* (Dem.), a newspaper that had uniformly opposed Prohibition and sustained High License and has done so since, published in its editorial columns, July 10, 1889, an exceedingly candid article, so important that we reproduce it entire:

> "The recent elections in Pennsylvania and Rhode Island have not in the slightest degree affected the principle that lies behind Prohibition. They have served only to establish the fact more thoroughly in the minds of those who are fighting the liquor traffic that their enemy is a giant in strength.
>
> "The difference between those who believe in Prohibition and those who believe in license is precisely the difference between right and wrong. The wrong may triumph, but it is none the less wrong. The right may fail, but it is none the less right.
>
> "If the liquor traffic is legitimate it should not be burdened with any more taxation than is borne by any other legitimate business. If it is

illegitimate or wrongful it should be wiped out altogether.

"Whatever the great bulk of those who are friendly to High License may think or believe, or however conscientious they may be, it is plain that the leaders in the movement are but instruments in the hands of the brewers and distillers. They know as well as they know anything that High License will not lead to the checking of intemperance in this country. They know as well as they know anything that the licensing of saloons legitimizes the traffic that fills the poor-houses, the jails, the penitentiaries and the lunatic asylums, and that furnishes victims for the gallows. They know that license, in effect, authorizes the whiskey seller to make men drunk and authorizes the whiskey-boozer to get drunk. If the traffic is to be legitimized at all then the man who falls a victim to it should not be held responsible for his offenses or his crimes. He is simply a victim of the system which permits a fellow-man to sell him liquid damnation for so much per drink, providing a license fee is paid into the public treasury.

"The open advocacy of the sale of whiskey is not so contemptible as the advocacy of license by those who profess friendship for the cause of temperance and morality. Those who are so ready to furnish proof going to show that Prohibition is a failure in Iowa and Kansas are paid for furnishing it. If Prohibition is a failure in either of the States named, intelligent people, whether friendly or unfriendly to temperance, understand why it is so. The brewers and distillers of the country have spared neither labor nor money to bring Prohibition into ridicule in Iowa and Kansas. They have shipped beer and whiskey into these States free of charge to those who would handle it, and they have had agents employed, and they have them now, who will give whiskey or beer free of charge to those who will drink it. The end they are aiming at is to make Prohibition appear ridiculous in the sight of the public. It is almost impossible in either of these States to bring about a conviction for violation of the Prohibition law, because the money of the brewers and distillers is used freely to corrupt witnesses and jurors and in suborning testimony.

"The High License newspaper might just as well show its hand plainly. If it isn't paid for the work it is doing it is doing very dirty work for nothing."

The St. Louis *Daily Republic* (Dem.), after an election at which the political power of the High License saloons of that city (each paying an annual license fee of $559) had been strikingly and offensively shown, attacked the existing license policy in scathing language. It said:

"These dives [the lowest] are so numerous in the city, their organization is so compact, their clientele so extensive, that as long as present conditions remain they will control the city completely. . . . Our present license law was intended to break their power, but as far as it applies to St. Louis it has rather served to increase it. It is just high enough to discriminate against the respectable saloon in favor of the low-class resorts which make an enormous profit on cheap beer and vile whiskey." (Nov. 9, 1888.)

"The groggery, the gambling-house and the brothel control the city's affairs and openly boast their power, and woe to the man who by fair deeds and respect for the laws and his oath of office invites their enmity. He is crushed without mercy, and a more pliant figure-head set up in his place." (Nov. 11, 1888.)

The Omaha *Daily Bee* (Rep.), one of the most persevering defenders of the High License law of Nebraska and intolerant opponents of Prohibition, was frank enough to say, Dec. 10, 1888, speaking of the saloons of that city, each of which paid annually $1,000 for the privilege of license:

"No one can deny that the license system, as now existing in our city, has been a source of corruption and irregularity. It has had a demoralizing effect upon members of the City Council and the City Clerk. It has exacted political support from the low dives and bummers; it has compelled the orderly liquor-dealers to support with money and influence the very worst element of the city, and has used the liquor men to do the dirty work at the primaries and elections."

According to the undivided testimony of the anti-Prohibition press of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, even the extraordinary restrictive conditions prevailing in those cities were wholly neutralized before the Brooks law had been in operation for two years. The Pittsburgh *Commercial Gazette* (Rep.) said, Jan. 27, 1890:

"As the time for the municipal election approaches the speak-easies[1] become bolder in conducting their illegal business. Yesterday [Sunday] not a few of the select 700 [unlicensed places][2] were running wide open. They were not 'speak-easies,' but 'yell-louds,' as they disturbed their neighborhoods with their boisterous conduct. What inducements have regularly licensed saloons to observe the law and renew their licenses in the spring if saloons that pay no license are permitted to sell not only through the week but on Sundays, when of all the days they should be kept shut? The disregard of the Prohibition law in Maine, Iowa and Kansas, that is a very weighty argument against Prohibition, is no more flagrant than the disregard of the High License law in this city. If Prohibition is a failure there, then is High License a failure here—at least about election times. The speak-easies have, or imagine they have, a 'pull,' on the political parties that they thus dare to impudently disregard the law, and the party that would command the respectable vote, which is much stronger than the speak-easy following, would do well to prove its independence of speak-easy influence before election time."

---

[1] A Pennsylvania name for unlicensed liquor saloons.

[2] Thus on the authority of one of the most prominent advocates of High License and restriction, there were 700 lawless saloons running in Pittsburgh in January, 1890. Yet at the last previous session of the License Court only 93 licenses had been granted!

The Philadelphia *Press*, chief Republican organ of Pennsylvania, after informing itself thoroughly about the situation in Pittsburgh, said editorially, Jan. 6, 1890:

"All accounts agree that High License is a failure in Pittsburgh. 'Speak-easies,' or unlicensed groceries have multipled in every section of the city, until now it is believed that the number of places where liquor is sold is considerably greater than it was two years ago under low license. These 'speak-easies' are thinly disguised as 'soft-drink' places, cigar-shops and restaurants. They get their supplies of liquor in the dead of night and sell without hindrance or regulation, when they please and to whom they please."

The Philadelphia *Times* (Ind.), speaking of conditions in Philadelphia, said, Jan. 22, 1890:

"There is a general complaint of the large number of places where liquor is sold without a license. These surreptitious barrooms do their principal business on Sundays, when the licensed saloons are closed, though many of them are in operation during the week. They are conducted under various disguises or with no disguise at all, and for the most part they are known to the policeman on the beat."

THE RUM POWER AND HIGH LICENSE.

No testimony is of greater interest or value than that furnished by the liquor-sellers themselves. The great object of temperance legislation is to reduce the sales of liquor. This cannot be done without crippling the traffic. No persons are so well qualified as the drink-dealers to testify concerning the efficacy of any particular system. Do the drink-dealers regard High License as a temperance measure, which interferes with or menaces their traffic?

It is true that many liquor men doing business under low license laws antagonize High License bills when proposed for enactment. Such bills imply an increased expense to each man in the traffic. To numerous retailers they imply the necessity of quitting the business. The small retailers outnumber by a very large majority the more prosperous dealers. The wealthy men in "the trade" cannot afford to incur the enmity of their fellows by encouraging a revolutionary policy. Therefore in nearly every State the liquor element has shown more or less antagonism to High License legislation when first suggested. But the attitude of the traffic previously to the actual trial of High License does not merit serious consideration. It is certain, however, that even in the low license States High License is secretly desired by the more intelligent rumsellers. This point was made clear by the New York *Tribune*, which said, during the High License campaign of 1888 in New York (Sept. 27):

"One of the developments of this campaign which is going to startle everybody will be the number of saloon-keepers who are now talking and will be found working and voting for Warner Miller and High License. Ask the owner of a first-class saloon in this city if he favors High License, and he will give you good business reasons why he should do so."

In seeking the opinions of the representative liquor-sellers, however, inquiry need not extend beyond those who are entitled to speak with authority for "the trade" in general and those who have had practical experience under High License laws.

J. M. Atherton, President of the National Protective Association, the foremost organization of distillers and wholesale liquor-dealers in the United States, wrote as follows in a letter to E. O. Fox of Eaton Rapids, Mich., dated at Louisville, Ky., March 2, 1889:

"The two most effective weapons with which to fight Prohibition are High License and Local Option. . . . The true policy for the trade to pursue is to advocate as high a license as they can in justice to themselves afford to pay, because the money thus raised tends to relieve all owners of property from taxation and keeps the treasuries of the towns and cities pretty well filled. This catches the ordinary taxpayer, who cares less for the sentimental opposition to our business than he does for taxes on his own property. . . . Until Prohibition is destroyed, or its political efforts broken, I repeat that our best weapons to fight it with are High License and Local Option by townships. If Local Option can be defeated without encouraging Prohibition, it should be done. These are my views in a general way. Of course each locality and State has its peculiarities, and must modify its views to such existing conditions, but I think the suggestions I have herein given you are sound."

In 1888, while High License bills were pending in the Legislatures of New York and New Jersey, confidential letters, intended for the guidance of the traffic in those States, were written by a number of distillers and brewers doing business under High License in the West. Peter E. Iler, the most prominent distiller of Nebraska, wrote from Omaha (Jan. 7):

"1. High License has not hurt our business, but, on the contrary, has been a great benefit to it as well as to the people generally.

"2. I believe somewhat as you say the Cincinnati *Volksblatt* says, that High License acts as a bar against Prohibition It is especially so in this State, as the tax from the license goes towards supporting the schools, thereby relieving the citizens and farmers of just so much tax that they would otherwise have to pay, and is therefore especially beneficial to the poor and laboring classes. It also gives the business more of a tone and legal standing, and places it in hands of a better class of people.

"3. I do not think that High License lessens the quantity of liquor used, but places it in fewer and better hands with better regularity.

"4. As to the trade repealing the High License law, if the question was left to it, I do not think, so far as my acquaintance is concerned, that it would do so. I have an extensive acquaintance through this State, and I believe if it were put to a vote of the liquor-dealers and saloon men whether it should be High License, no license or low license, that they would almost unanimously be for High License. Those objecting would be a class without responsibility or character, who never pay for anything if they can help it, and simply start in business for a few months with a view of beating every one they can; and of course, naturally such a class would not want this law. I cannot see how any one who has anything at stake can help but favor High License and enforcing the law strictly.

"5. I would be in favor of High License rather than trust to the non-enforcement of the law under Prohibition. If you undertake to do your business without protection you are blackmailed by one-horse attorneys, which in the end amounts to many times the cost of a license every year, even if the license be very high. We have had a great deal of business in the State of Iowa, both before it was Prohibition and since, and we can say positively that there is very little satisfaction in doing business in that State now. Ever so often the goods are seized, and it causes a great deal of delay and trouble to get them released; and then there is a fear of not getting money for the goods, and all the forms we have to go through make it very annoying business. It is like running a railroad under ground. You don't know where you are going or what is ahead. In all my experience of ten years in Ohio before the temperance movement and twenty years' experience here previous to High License and since, I believe that High License is one of the grandest laws for the liquor traffic, and for men interested as well as people at large, there is. The only objection that we have here is that the regulations are not more strictly enforced than they are. I do not believe we would have any Prohibition people in the State if our High License law was more rigidly enforced."

Metz & Bro., the leading brewers of Nebraska, wrote from Omaha (Jan. 20):

"High License has been of no injury to our business. In our State we think it bars out Prohibition. We are positively certain that were it not for our present High License law Nebraska, to-day, would have Prohibition. Please understand that our High License law is also a Local Option law. In our opinion High License does not lessen the consumption of liquor. If left to us, we (the liquor-dealers) would never repeal this law. There are a great many difficulties at first for the brewers and liquor-dealers to get a High License law in working order, but after a year or two you will certainly find it to your advantage over Prohibition. We at first made a bitter fight against its enforcement, but since it is well enforced we would not do without it."

Henry H. Shufeldt & Co., the well-known distillery firm of Chicago, wrote (Jan. 6):

"'Has High License been any hurt to your business?' We think not. It weeds out the irresponsible retailers, injuring at first those wholesale dealers who have been selling them, but eventually placing the retailing in more responsible hands, thus making collections better among the wholesalers and thus benefiting the distiller. It may carry down some of the weaker wholesalers who need but little adversity to destroy them, but it eventually places the whole line from the retailer to the distiller on a safe footing. We believe that High License is the only remedy for Prohibition, but coupled with High License should be discretionary power in issuing licenses and just regulations regarding the selling to drunkards, minors, etc. Remove the disreputable elements of the business and the majority of the people will be satisfied. . . . We think the trade in any State should favor High License and just restrictions, and that it is the only solvent of the question."[1]

Similar confidential letters of advice were written in 1890 by influential members of the liquor trade for the benefit of the persons conducting the anti-Prohibition campaign in Nebraska. Devereaux & Meserve, wholesale liquor-dealers of Boston, wrote (March 7): "Advocate High License and reach all the politicians and others of influence. Do not think you can silence the pulpit, but you can induce some of them to advocate High License on moral grounds." Bowler Bros., brewers, of Worcester, Mass., wrote (March 7): "Your great battle cry must be 'High License vs. Prohibition.'" Emanuel Furth, attorney for the Pennsylvania State Liquor League, wrote (March 7): "My experience has taught me that the public advocacy of High License together with legislation regulating and restricting the traffic produces the best results."[1]

---

[1] Other letters will be found in "The Political Prohibitionist for 1888," 22.

In the article, CONSTITUTIONAL PROHIBITION, especially under the heads "Massachusetts," "Pennsylvania" and "Rhode Island," we have shown that the High License argument has been one of the most potent influences operating to defeat Prohibition in representative and critical contests.

For several years the tendency has been steadily towards monopolizing the liquor traffic in a few hands. The distilling business is now practically controlled by trade combinations which wield despotic power. The brewing interests are being rapidly consolidated, particularly under the auspices of an English syndicate of capitalists; and in all the manufacturing branches of the traffic the policy of centralization has been practically accepted. The retail traffic in nearly all the large cities is to a great extent conducted by mere hired agents of the brewers; a very large majority of the saloons in the representative centers are mere "tied houses" of great brewing concerns. [See LIQUOR TRAFFIC.] The effect of High License is to precipitate the monopolization of the liquor interests for which the shrewdest men in the traffic are laboring as a consummation eminently desirable for commercial reasons. High License legislation therefore promotes the two most important objects now sought by the organized liquor power in the United States: to defeat the Prohibition movement by a compromise policy and to effect a thorough consolidation of trade interests.

Historical and Philosophical Notes on Intemperance.—The survey proposed by the title of this article derives its interest from the two well-worn sayings, that "history is philosophy teaching by example," and that "whatever has a history has a law." It is the law as to intemperance, as it exists in nature and has found expression in civil statutes, which lies at the foundation of the present inquiry. Yet more, as statute laws are enacted either by the voice of the people or by classes who recognize the people's demand, the history of intemperance reveals what classes of society, male or female, young or old, private citizens or public officers, cultured or professional, have been most exposed, most prominent, and therefore especially to be mentioned in the history of intemperance.

The meaning of terms is learned by their use in common conversation and by writers who analyze language. The fullest and clearest statement of the nature of intemperance is found in the Greek writers, who fully studied the history of the effects of intoxicating drinks and who had widely observed as well as carefully analyzed the demands of the public interest and duty as to their use. Never, probably, was this discussion so thorough as it was made by the greatest of Grecian teachers, and in the writings of Xenophon, Plato and Aristotle, who discussed all moral questions and comprehended the wisdom of all ages.

The first two of the 12 books of Plato's Laws are almost wholly devoted to the discussion of the moral demands upon the civil authorities of any community which justify and compel legislation restraining from the use of intoxicating wines. A Spartan insists that military hardihood requires entire abstinence; while on the other hand an Athenian argues that though women, children and servants should be prohibited their use, men of mature age may seek their stimulus, except pilots, magistrates and men having like responsible trusts, who must never allow their clearness of mind to be in the least endangered by any stimulant. Meanwhile a Cretan (representing Minos, who was the generally-recognized Moses of the early Grecian legislation) maintains this balanced judgment, that there is a distinction between mere beverages and nourishing food. As to food, there should be no restrictive law, since temperance, or the moderate use, should be learned and followed by each individual without civil statutes to control; while parents and guardians, however (as stewards in the army and on shipboard), must apportion food supplies. On the other hand, intoxicating liquors are entirely different from food. Their use should be restricted and prohibited. The Athenian had argued that positive "temperance" can only be learned by having once tasted the intoxicating cup, and asks (Plato, Laws, i, 14, 15): "How will anyone be perfectly temperate who has not fought with and overcome by reason and effort and art, in sport and in earnest, many sensual indulgences and lusts that urge him to act with shamelessness and wrong?" This led Xenophon, who wrote not only his "Memorabilia of Socrates," but his "Anabasis" or military journey with Cyrus into Asia Minor, and his "Cyropedia" or training of a prince, to give two meanings to the term "temperance"—one, moderation in healthful indulgence; the other, abstinence from things dangerous, as the use of intoxicating wines. (Xenophon, Memor. ii, i, 1.) Aristotle makes the same distinction, urging at length its importance. As to the former he states (Nichom. Eth. ii, 2: 6, 7, 8): "By *abstaining* from sensual indulgences we become temperate; and, when we have become so, we are best able to abstain from them." As to the latter he declares that positive law must restrain and prohibit it, and he says: "Just, then, as the Trojan elders felt respecting Helen (Iliad, iii, 158), must we feel respecting unlawful pleasure: in all cases we must pronounce sentence as they did; for thus by sending it away we shall be less likely to fall into fatal error" (ii, 9: 3, 4, 5). As to the vice of "intemperance," commenting on the Greek word for "temperance" (*egkratia*, having "inward strength"), he compares (vii, 8: 1) licentiousness with "drunkenness," stating that "The former is incurable, the latter curable. The former, as a depravity (or *functional* disorder), resembles dropsy or loss of flesh; but licentiousness resembles epilepsy (an *organic* disease): the former is permanent, the latter is not permanent."

---

[1] These letters were all addressed to William E. Johnson of Lincoln, Neb., and were published in the *Voice* for April 3 and 17, and May 8, 1890.

This view of intemperance as a bodily disease and a depravity, derived from the very term to express it, as "abstinence" from drinks that derange the action of reason and self-control, passed down through all subsequent literature, entering into the Greek of the Old and New Testament precepts as to the use of intoxicants; being especially marked in Paul's use of the term before Felix and in his Epistles; while it rules in all the early and later Greek Church writers, and has led to the universal use of a wine made from fresh raisins where unintoxicating wines are not accessible in sacred rites. Without this careful notice of the meaning of temperance, the laws of Judea, Egypt, Greece and Rome, prohibiting the use of intoxicating liquors, and that because they lead to "intemperance," could not be understood; nor could its history, as recorded by Brahminic, Hebrew, Greek or Roman writers, be comprehended so as to be a practical guide.

The history of intemperance, as of other vices, is marked by stages of increase and decrease, of indulgence and abstinence—the prevalence of a demand for express statutes against intemperance bringing out its history. It should be carefully noted that ancient records, like modern newspaper reports, may mislead as to the extent of intemperance; for, as in New York the exceptional cases of drunkenness, as of other immoralities, are all reported, these violations of the law do not represent the mass of the people, whose observance of law is not mentioned. In tracing this history, regard to time, especially of leading eras, must first be observed; next the distinction of races and nations, especially the most cultured; while in each age and nation it should be carefully observed, first, that statutes prohibiting intoxicating liquors, and second, that philanthropic provision of unintoxicating beverages, are the most palpable links in the chain of the history of intemperance.

First Era: Patriarchal History (*from B. C.* 2350 *to* 1600).—All writers note that intemperance begins with Noah, the second and actual head of the human race. It is worthy of note, as observed by the ablest critics of sacred and secular literature, that the intoxication of Noah, the head of the three human families, was first, the result of ignorance of law, and second, was a lesson instructive in all time. While Eve in tasting the *unexpressed* juice of the forbidden fruit was forewarned by the divine prohibition and yet was beguiled by the tempter, Noah "was beginning" (as the English, following the Greek rendering of Gen. 9: 23 intimates) "to be a husbandman," and was, therefore, ignorant of the poison of decay in the *expressed* juice of the grape, the most healthful and luscious of fruits. The effects of his intemperance, on himself and on two of his sons, Shem and Japhet, the heads of the Asiatic and European races, is manifestly an indication of a law leading to temperance; while on Ham, the head of the African race, and especially on Canaan, the most abandoned son of Ham, it is an indication of an implanted hereditary appetite leading to intemperance. This appears in the more than beastly licentiousness, and in the deranging effects of intoxicating wines, which had corrupted even the daughters of righteous Lot who were betrothed to "Sodomites" (Gen. 19: 5, 8, 31–36); a corruption whose cause is especially kept in mind by the Old Testament writers, as Moses (Deut. 33: 32) and the prophets, in their allusions to Sodom. It is the key to all former and subsequent history as to the evils of intemperance, which Jesus declares in his statement of the prime cause of all associated vices and faults, which brought the destruction of the flood in Noah's day and of earthquake and fire on Sodom; putting this first: "They ate, they drank" (Luke 17:27, 28);—intemperance through lust leading on to corruption of every relation in life.

In that same age there was a pure use of wine both by religious leaders in Canaan, as Melchizedek (Gen. 14: 18), who was superior in pious devotion to Abraham (Heb. 7: 4, 7), and in Chaldea, where even Job, who lived 140 years after a family of sons and daughters had attained mature age, had reason to fear that a curse might follow their feasts (Job 1: 4, 5, 13; 8: 4; 42: 16). The most important fact in the patriarchal history is the discovery of a mode of preserving wines from ferment, indicated in the "tirosh" blessed by Isaac (Gen. 27: 28, 37). The mode of preparation of these unfermented wines is depicted on tomb-walls of that age.

Second Era: Early Asiatic and African History (*from B. C.* 1600 *to* 1100).—This period, extending back to an earlier history in Babylonia, Egypt and India, the three centres of earliest civilization and culture, the period of written history and of ancient Asiatic literature, embraces the ages of Moses and of the Hebrew commonwealth ruled by Judges. The history of intemperance in this age is to be traced, first, in the early Vedas of India, to which Moses seems to allude (Deut. 8 : 4), since he uses numerous terms borrowed from the Sanscrit language; second, in the books of Moses, of Joshua and Judges; and third, in the statements of Herodotus and later Greek historians. In Egypt the details of the vice of intemperance in the use both of luxuries and wines are pictured on the walls of early tombs; while three facts cause this violation to stand out in prominence: (1) The very early discovery of the mode of preserving wines free from ferment, which unintoxicating wines were stored in such abundance, as the tomb-walls indicate, that it is doubtful whether the pictures of disgusting spewing at feasts do not represent the intemperance of luxury rather than that of intoxication; (2) The fact that abstinent societies, bearing the Hebrew name of "Nazarites," had grown up before Moses's day, for whom he gives laws as an already existing association (Num. 6 : 1–15), and whose very existence indicates a demand growing out of prevalent intemperance; (3) The prohibition of wines to priests, found written on an Egyptian scroll of papyrus, prior to and confirming later statements of Herodotus, Diodorus and others, in which these words occur: "Thou knowest that wine is an abomination. Thou hast taken an oath as to strong drink that thou wouldst not take such into thee. Hast thou forgotton thy vow?"

In India the existence of early intemperance is indicated by these facts: (1) That in early education entire abstinence is required, and that entire abstinence is a permanent law for Brahmins or the priestly class; (2) That the military class are specially warned against indulgence; (3) That abstinence is urged as a virtue on lower classes, as merchants, and (4) That intemperance is the prominent vice declared to unfit men for a pure and happy life beyond the grave. Among the statutes of Menu, who gives a digest of the laws of the Vedas, is one which forbids youth to have any intercourse with "a drinker of intoxicating liquors" (iii, 159). The life-long abstinence of Brahmins is thus enjoined: "Any twice-born man (the designation of the priestly class), who has intentionally drunk spirits of rice, must drink more of the same spirit on fire," "or he may drink boiling, until he die, the urine of a cow" (xi, 91). If he have drunk intoxicants "unknowingly," penalties lasting an entire year are imposed (xi, 92). As to kings, it is declared that if guilty of the "ten vices," among which "drunkenness" is prominent, "a king must lose both his wealth and his virtue . . . . and even his life" (vii, 46, 47, 50). As to the future life, this penalty is recorded: "A priest who has drunk spirituous liquors shall migrate into the form of a smaller or larger worm or insect, of a moth or of a fly, feeding on ordure, or of some carnivorous animal" (xii, 56).

This vice in Chaldea is only indirectly indicated at this era, in records not yet fully deciphered.

In the history of Israel its records belong to the subject of BIBLE WINES. The united vices of Egypt, developed both in the Israelites and with the "mixed multitude" that went out with them, break out at Sinai in intemperance, as the leading vice, to whose influence the historic Psalmist and Christ's great Apostle attribute all their future vices and the penalties following, as embodied in the statement: "The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play" (Ex. 12: 38; 32: 6, 19; Psal. 106: 14; 1 Cor. 10: 7). Moses himself in his farewell address links this, as does Jesus afterwards, with the vice of Sodom; intemperance being the "root of gall" in all history (Deut. 29: 16–28; Luke 17: 28). This law of intemperance and its ever attending penalty (seen in the infliction of death on a drunkard's son, Deut. 21: 18–21), is one of the facts most clearly revealed (Deut. 29: 29); while cowardice, which violation of the law of temperance engenders, brought all their national failures and sufferings (Deut. 32: 28–38). It is a natural connection which appears in the facts which follow this outbreak of intemperance while Moses is receiving their law at Sinai: the statute requiring religious teachers to abstain from intoxicating wine, so like to that of the Brahmins of India (Lev. 10: 9); the laws for the Nazarite abstainers (Num. 6 : 1–21); the special direction that the wine of the people's offering shall be "fresh unfermented grape-juice" (Num. 18:12); and the cowardice of the military leaders, and their subsequent rashness, leading to defeat, are just the history repeated in all lands down to that of the French in 1870 (Num. 13 : 31; 14 : 40–45). The 400 years of the Judges show the alternating history of the reign of intemperance and abstinence; the vow of Samson's mother and of Hannah indicating a spirit of the age that called for it (Judges 13 : 4, 7; comp. 9: 27; 16: 25; 1 Sam. 1: 13, 15, 28; comp. 2 : 12–36). Interwoven is the picture of country delight in the "fruit of the vine," seen in Boaz and his fields (Ruth 2 : 14), whose perpetuation now in the south of France led Dr. Duff to new views of the simple "fruit of the vine" appointed by Christ for laborers in his vineyard.

Third Era: Ancient Asiatic and Early Grecian Military Government (*from about B. C.* 1100 *to* 500).—This era corresponds very nearly to that of the kings of Israel and Judah, and to the long list of Grecian and Roman, Babylonian and Persian, Chinese and other writers who have directly or indirectly presented this history. Here, as in the previous history, the sad fulfillments of the warnings of both Moses and Samuel as to temptations of monarchical or military government follows (Deut. 17: 14–17; 1 Sam. 8: 5–18) a record belonging to Bible history. The most instructive pages of the history of intemperance are found in its alternating revival and decline, in rulers like David and Solomon, of Belshazzar and Cyrus, according as the spirit of abstinence from or indulgence in intoxicating wines ruled. In this respect the history of the kings and kingdoms of Israel and Judah is like that of Babylonia and Persia. In David's early life as a shepherd his beverage was the fresh-pressed juice of the grape (Psal. 23 : 6; and 2 Sam. 6 : 19); as all visitors to Palestine, Italy and southern France have recognized in present customs, and as has been elaborated in all ages of the Christian Church by early Greeks, as Origen and Epiphanius in the Greek, by Cyprian, Ambrose and Jerome in the Roman, and by Cocceius in the early Reformed churches. But in early life he met men like Nabal, who in luxurious ease "drank himself drunk" on intoxicating wine (1 Sam. 25: 36). When, again, his home was invaded and his family carried away by marauding desert hordes, he was able with a handful of men, ruled by abstinence, to overtake and rout an army "eating and drinking and dancing" (1 Sam. 30 : 16). His Psalms, as well as the history of his degenerate sons, show the curse on his family and his kingdom which intemperance brought. Ammon, brother of Absalom, is guilty of incest; he is next carousing, "merry with wine;" in his drunken debauch he is assassinated by his brother's order; David is overcome with uncontrollable grief; his sons share his humiliation and bitter agony; the slayer is prompted to rebellion; he dies a wretched death, and David's cup of woe overflows (2 Sam. 13: 6–14, 28, 29, 31, 36, 37–39; 14: 24, 28, 33; 15: 3, 4, 23, 30; 16 : 5–8; 18 : 13). Such experiences, no wonder, drew out the confession of personal indignity: "With hypocritical mockers in feasts, they gnashed upon me with their teeth" (Psal. 35 : 16); and again the lament, afterwards verified in this prophecy of Jesus, "I was the song of the drunkards" (Psal. 69: 12; compare verse 21 with Mat. 27: 34–44). No wonder that in the only four cases of David's use of the term "yayin" (wine), one pictures the delight of his early pure life (Psal. 104: 15), on whose nature all students, Hebrew or Christian, were agreed; while the other three are in the following words: "Thou hast made us to drink the wine of astonishment" (Psal. 60 : 3); "In the hand of the Lord is a cup, and the wine is red" (Psal. 75 : 8); "The Lord awaked . . . as a mighty man that shouteth by reason of wine" (Psal. 78: 65). Solomon's youthful experience of the delights of intoxicating beverages and his warnings against the intoxicating wines are central in Asiatic as well as Hebrew history, since they fill the three works of his life as divine teaching. To the maiden of his early, pure attachment, in her country home, to whom he speaks, "Thy love is better than wine" (Cant. 1 : 2, 4, and 4 : 10), and she responds, "He brought me to the banqueting house, and his banner over me was love" (2 : 4),—to this maiden, Solomon, in the purity of his youth, indicates the pure fruit of the wine then drunk thus: "I have drunk my wine with my milk" (5: 1); "The best wine for my beloved" (7: 9); "I would cause thee to drink of spiced wine" (8: 2). In the poem of his mature years, he traces all vices, enticement to licentiousness, neglect of parental remonstrances, demoralizing passion, and finally insensibility to all degradation, to intoxicating wine. He speaks of "the wine of violence" (Prov. 4: 17); of the abandoned seducer's "mingled" and inflaming wine (9: 2, 5); and he declares, "Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging" (20 : 1). Clustered in connection are these associated warnings: "Be not among wine bibbers; The drunkard and the glutton shall come to poverty; Hearken unto thy father that begat thee, and to thy mother when she is old; The strange woman lieth in wait, as for a prey, and increaseth the transgressors among men. Who hath woe, who hath sorrow? Who hath contentions? Who hath babblings? Who hath wounds without cause? Who hath redness of eyes? They that tarry long at the wine; they that go to seek mixed wine. Look not on the wine when it is red, when it giveth its color in the cup, when it moveth itself aright. At last it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder. Thine eyes shall behold strange women, and thine heart shall utter perverse things. Yea, thou shalt be as he that lieth down in the midst of the sea, or as he that lieth upon the top of a mast. They have stricken me, shalt thou say, and I was not sick; they have beaten me, and I felt it not. When shall I awake? I will seek it yet again" (Prov. 23: 20–35). The annals of literature do not contain a more perfect picture – not even Paul's picture in Romans I, and Tacitus's history of Nero's age, as the statements of both writers are now revealed in unburied Pompeii – than this by Solomon of the successive stages of drunken debauch, ending with the spewing as in seasickness, the stupid insensibility to the blows of excited comrades, and the mad return to drink again, like "the dog to his vomit, and the swine to wallowing in the mire," so often alluded to by Solomon (Prov. 23: 8; 25: 16; 26: 11), by Isaiah (19: 14; 28: 8), by Jeremiah 48: 26), by Jesus (Matt. 7 : 6) and by Peter (2 Peter 2: 22). So like in all its links is the chain of the fruits of intemperance, that this last and most disgusting degradation of animals had passed in early history into a proverb. The most instructive of all is the fact that Solomon, like all men early and truly taught and wrought of God, confesses his own folly when, having become more than sated with the luxuries of the king, he in his old age turned "preacher" (Eccl. 6: 1; 12: 2, 3); when he sought to reach youth and men of station because, like reformed drinkers in this and all ages, he "could be touched with the feeling of their infirmities," even as the stainless Redeemer himself could not be (Eccl. 1: 16, 17; 2: 3, 24–26; 11: 9, 10).

The division of the kingdom of Israel brought the northern Israelites into closer contact with foreign nations, and introduced their habits of intemperance, as the prophetic writers of that age indicate. Isaiah's picture is most touching, of the Divine Father, who had especially chosen Israel for his people, looking down to see the corrupted fruit and the corrupter wine of his vineyard, while of rulers he writes: "They rise early in the morning to follow strong drink, that continue until night till wine inflame them," that boast because "mighty to drink wine"—this intemperance sapping their vigor, inflaming passion and proving thus the cause of their captivity (5: 1–22). Then Egypt comes in, "caused to err in every work as a drunken man staggereth in his vomit" (19 : 14). Then Tyre, the Phœnician mart, sighs because intemperance has brought neglected fields; because "the fresh new wine nourisheth, there is a cry for wine in the streets," and "strong drink is bitter" (24: 7–11). Then comes the fearful penalty on "the drunkards of Ephraim," the glorious beauty of their fat valleys faded, because, "overcome with wine, they have erred through wine" (28: 1–14); the final result being bloody battles, they becoming "drunken but not with wine, drunken with their own blood" (29: 9; 49: 26; 51: 21). The divine appeal, quoted in every hamlet to this day, "Come, buy wine and milk without money and without price" (55: 1), is literally fulfilled where temperance reigns.

Hosea, writing in the same land and time, touches the root of associated evils when he writes: "Whoredom and wine and new wine take away the heart" (4 : 11); and again, when of debauched Ephraim he says: "The princes have made him sick with wine" (7: 5). Joel brings out the yet darker picture that drinkers of wine will sell their own daughters into lives of infamy for wine (1 : 5; 3 : 3). Amos, calling to mind an earthquake sent as a warning, remonstrates with those who sought to corrupt abstainers, giving them wine and themselves drinking it in bowls (1:1; 2:12; 6:6). Nahum, picturing intemperance in Nineveh, and its effect as "drying thorns for burning," says: "while they are drunken as drunkards they shall be devoured as stubble fully dry" (1:1, 10). Finally, Habakkuk, picturing the craving for licentious indecency, awakened intentionally now as in all ages in drinking saloons, utters the warning: "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink; that putteth thy bottle to them, that maketh them drunken also, that thou mayest look on their nakedness."

Turning from Israel to more isolated Judah, even among them intemperance and its penalties appear. While the connections of the northern kingdom are more extended—with Syria (where David's son Absalom was corrupted at the court of his mother's father), with Tyre (among whose merchants Solomon's servants learned luxury), and indirectly with Nineveh on the Tigris and Babylon on the Euphrates,—Judah's prophets mention unlike and like associations; Jeremiah picturing influences coming from Edom and Egypt, Daniel those of captives in Babylon, and Ezekiel of captives on the Tigris. Jeremiah pictures the tauntings, like those of David, like those now met from "moderate drinkers," defending their indulgence and boasting their power to stop with "moderation;" but Jeremiah declares that even their kings, priests and prophets will drift into "drunkenness" (13 : 13, 14); for the "pastors," unlike the shepherd David, are "overcome with wine" and "scatter the sheep," while, as now, their excited harangues are "false dreams" (23 :1, 9–12, 21–34). Glancing at the whole circuit of surrounding nations, from Arabia on the southeast to the Medes on the northeast, and from Egypt to Tyre on the west, in bold figure the prophet represents the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, because they will not heed the voice of warning, exclaiming: "Drink ye, and be drunken, and spew and fall, and rise no more! because of the sword which I will send among you" (25:15–28). To test Judah's spirit of obedience to their divine lawgiver, the prophet brings into the temple the Rechabites, true, because of their father's teachings, to their vow of abstinence (35:1–14). Finally, he pictures Edom, nigh to Jerusalem, and Babylon, where they were to be tried in captivity, as seducers, speaking of Babylon as "the golden cup in the Lord's hand," of whom it is said: "She made all the earth drunken; the nations have drunken of her wine; therefore the nations are mad; Babylon is suddenly fallen and destroyed" (Jer. 51: 7, 8); while of Edom he writes: "The cup also shall pass through unto thee; thou shalt be drunken, and make thyself naked" (Lam. 4: 21).

It is in perfect keeping with these Hebrew records, written at a distance, to find Daniel and Xenophon in accord as eye-witnesses of intemperanee and its curse in the rich valley of the Euphrates and Tigris, the early home of mankind, and of Persia and Media beyond – all of whom began with the lesson of Noah's experience, while only true piety saved the rulers and people from fall. Daniel finds the king's wine intoxicating and will not drink of it, proving the virtue of abstinence by using only wine that was the fresh product of the vine, drank by the Pharaoh of Jacob's day (Dan. 1: 5, 8–21 and 10 : 3; compare with Gen. 40 : 9–13). The mingling of all the vices that have ruined princes and people has its climax in Belshazzar, feasting with his concubines, sacrilegiously sending for the sacred vessels dedicated to religious rites by Moses and Solomon, and drinking wine out of them; while that very night the Persian invaders, taking advantage of this insane revelry of Babylonian leaders, and breaking into the city, brought with them a purer sway (Dan. 5: 1–4, 30, 31; 10: 1; comp. Ezra 1 : 1–31). That better day dawned because of the pure life of that Cyrus pictured by Xenophon; and the restoration of God's law, binding in all ages alike on political and religious leaders, was thus prophesied by Ezekiel: "Neither shall any priest drink wine when they enter into the inner court" (44: 21).

These constant allusions in the Hebrew Scriptures to intemperance in Asiatic nations prepare us for the statements of Greek poets like Homer, of historians like Xenophon, and of philosophers both of Greece and Rome. Even Grecian and Roman moralists censured Homer, who wrote about B. C. 900, for picturing gods as both lustful and given to wine; and there is a species of criticism that in our day perverts the very idea of Homer as of the Hebrew inspired poets. By gods and demi-gods, Homer, whose poems are all studded with recognitions of the one living and true God, the maker and ruler of all, means men who claim to be and ought to be his representatives; while, too, in the Asiatic Trojans, in whose city and by his own family the seducer of the Grecian Helen is for ten years sustained both by popular and family support, Homer, as Grecian, Roman and later sages have noted, means to picture just what Daniel describes in the divine claim of Nebuchadnezzar that his image should be worshipped, and the acquiescence of Darius in the command that no prayer should for 30 days be offered to any God but him; though both Nebuchadnezzar and Darius recognized and worshipped the one true god (Dan. 2 : 47; 3 : 6, 29; 6 : 6–9, 20, 26). In the Iliad the simple fare of Grecians in the camp is presented, Spartan-like in rejection of intoxicating wines; while in the Odyssey the luxurious feasts of indolent courtiers fill the narrative. The Greek warriors, compelled to sit at royal banquets, drank only "diluted wine," and this sparingly, pouring out most of it as a libation to deity, the idea of which is the sacrifice of luxury and especially the maintaining of abstinence from a sense of responsibility (Iliad, i, 598; ii, 128; iii, 391; iv, 3, 207; vi, 266; vii, 313–324; xix, 38, &c.),—the custom, still preserved, of christening a ship by pouring out wine on its deck implying that wine is abjured by seamen to whom sacred trusts of life and property are committed. In the Odyssey the accounts of the luxurious banquets spread by Telemachus for suitors who hoped to persuade his mother, Penelope, that her long-absent husband, Ulysses, is dead, fill the first book, Telemachus revealing his indignation at the luxury. The 5th Book brings in the two goat-skin bottles, "soaked in fragrant oil," to guard from ferment; one filled with water, the other with "sable wine" as supplies on the raft by which Ulysses escaped from Calypso's Isle. The 8th Book describes the banquet spread by Antinous for his unknown guest, at which Ulysses alone, who is the unknown guest, pours out the wine offered him as a libation to deity. The 10th contains his account of the "drugged wine," by which Circe transformed some of his men into "swine," and the 20th describes Ulysses's indignation at the luxury which he found reigning at his own court (which he has entered unknown), compelled, as seen in Book i, by the degenerate princes who were seeking his throne. No unadorned history could compare with these earliest Grecian poems in teaching the evils of intemperance; while the irreverent cast some have supposed in them is offset by the fact that at the banquets of pure deities sweet "nectar" is used, styled "aporrox," the drippings of the grape-clusters bursting when fully ripe (Odys. ix, 359).

Herodotus, writing four and a half centuries after Homer, about B. C. 450, brings out facts as to intemperance and its laws in Egypt, Persia and Greece. At the time of his visit, the Persian sway had brought a new era. Of the Egyptian priests he says: "They are of all men the most scrupulously attentive to the worship of the Gods." Among their rules of diet and sanitary laws, as minute as those of Moses for Levites, is mentioned: "Wine from the grape (*oinos ampelinos*) is given them" (ii, 37), recalling Joseph's day in Moses's record. Speaking of the people "who inhabit that part of Egypt which is sown with grain" (ii, 77), after describing their respect for ancient customs and regard for health, Herodotus says: "They feed on bread made of spelt (*olura*), which they call *kyllestis;* and they use wine made of barley (*krithe*), for they have no vines in that country." This accords with all ancient history and modern observation; for the vine is not indigenous to the alluvial soil of lower Egypt; it cannot be cultivated except on the lime-stone cliffs of the upper country; and it is only in the tombs of that upper region that the ancient representations of grape culture and wine-making are found. This record agrees also both with modern fact and ancient monumental records, showing that intemperance was confined to courts and was not the vice of common people. In describing the embalming of the dead (ii, 86), he states that the embalmers, after taking out the entrails from the abdomen, wash out the cavity with "palm wine;" *dead* bodies, not *living* bodies, being preserved by poisonous drugs. This wine is still made as an intoxicant in western Africa from the date-palms overshadowing the villages. Of the Persians, Herodotus makes a record almost word for word that of Tacitus on the ancient Germans: "The Persians are much addicted to wine, but they are not allowed to vomit in the presence of another. These customs are observed to this day. They are wont to debate important affairs when intoxicated; but whatever they have determined on in such deliberations is, on the following day when they are sober, proposed to them by the master of the house where they are met to consult; and if they approve of it when sober also, then they adopt it —if not, they reject it. Moreover, whatever they first resolved on when sober, they reconsider when intoxicated." The policy that ruled this barbarian practice, as it existed among the early Germans, Tacitus explains by saying that men when intoxicated reveal their real convictions, which when sober they might conceal.

The vital truths here revealed are these: first, in practice, as all history attests, drinking intoxicants is a social vice, seldom found in private homes, never except in companies, especially in "societies" gathered for excited debate, where leaders study how to rule; second, this vice of drinking is associated with convivial mirth, to drown the care that ought to rest on men with families; third, the common place of drinking is the saloon, where social becomes private vice, in the interest of the "master of the house" and not of his guests, and the saloon is frequented in all ages by fosterers of every vice and crime. The reasonings of Plato and Aristotle on the philosophy of intemperance are suggested logically in the mind of the reader who chances upon the following record of early Grecian history in Herodotus (vi, 84): Cleomenes, a Spartan General, having consulted the oracle at Delphi to learn whether he should conquer the Argives, and being deceived by the frequent device of the use of two Greek accusatives with an infinitive, in an oracle susceptible of being read either that "Cleomenes shall defeat the Argives" or that "the Argives shall defeat Cleomenes," and being enraged at the deception, demanded that he himself should offer sacrifice on the altar; when, being forbidden by the priests, he commanded his helots to "drag the priest from the altar and scourge him, while he himself sacrificed." Returning to Sparta he was found to be insane, and Herodotus adds: "Now the Argives say that on this account Cleomenes became insane and perished miserably. But the Spartans themselves say that Cleomenes became insane from divine influence, but that by associating with the Scythians he became the drinker of unmixed wine, and from that cause became mad." The student of the "philosophy of history," who finds the same truth recognized in all lands and ages, from the Brahmins of India to France in 1870, and studies the fact that not only men responsible as expounders of divine oracles, but as leaders of armies, must abstain from intoxicating wines—that student alone reaches the root of the evils of intemperance.

Xenophon's records prepare the way directly for the next era, since he as the pupil of Socrates brought to his master and fellow-disciples facts confirming their reasonings and his own convictions.

Fourth Era: Grecian Science and Philosophy Applied to the Social Vice of Intemperance.—Every step in historic survey gathers facts and suggests causes which permit at last inductive science; and yet more, it gives to statesmen a deductive philosophy guiding to laws that alone can meet the evil. This last stage covers all the past and comes down with its lessons to the present day. It begins with the school of Socrates at Athens, in which Xenophon, Plato and Aristotle were taught; it takes in the principles that led to the successive laws of the earlier Greek legislators, Minos, Lycurgus and Solon; it incorporates the experience of Grecian visitors to Egypt such as Phericides, Pythagoras and Herodotus; it adds also the profound reasonings of the Vedas of India sent home by Alexander to his teacher Aristotle; and it verifies the definition of philosophy given by Aristotle and adopted by Sir William Hamilton, that "philosophy is the science of sciences and art of arts."

For, in the very day of the reasonings of Plato and Aristotle as to intoxicants and their law, Rome had tested in statutes as to intemperance the theories of Grecian sages; the rule of Roman statutes had given stability and grandeur to their Republic; and science, tested by statutes, had fixed the tried and tested model for all future legislation against intemperance. In his "Anabasis," or expedition with Cyrus, and the retreat with his 10,000 Greeks from beyond the Tigris, Xenophon, preparing the way for Alexander, showed the value of abstinence from intoxicants in camps, marches and armed conflict. In his "Oikonomikos Logos," or economic treatise, from which Virgil and Cicero as well as Cato and Columella copied, lessons of rural temperance were taught, which were followed for ages throughout Greece and Italy. In his master work, his "Cyropaedia" or "Training of a Prince," Xenophon pictures the heir to the throne of the Medes, on a visit to his grandfather, the aged king of Persia, present at a royal banquet, watching with disgust the intoxication, lewdness and scurrility reigning, refusing the wine proffered to him because, as he told his grandfather, he thought there was "poison in the cup," citing as his reason, when asked, the king's own acts under its influence, and finally, when with surprise the king inquires: "Why, child, have you never seen the same happen to your father?" replying earnestly, "No, never!" (Cyro., B. i.) In his two added and most valuable works, his "Apomnemoneumata Sokratous," or "Memoirs of Socrates," and his "Symposion Philosophōn," or "Banquet of Philosophers," Xenophon shows, as does Plato after his master's execution, and as did the disciples of Jesus, the natural law and truth in precept, which ruled the teachings though not in many respects the practice of Socrates. Again, Hippocrates, the Greek physician, of the same age with Xenophon, about B. C. 420, gave the science of the action of intoxicating wine, his conclusions being accepted for five centuries by Greek successors, like Dioscorides, Aristæus and Galen, and later by medical teachers in all subsequent ages. French medical encyclopedists of the present century devote volumes to the confirmation of the science of Hippocrates and of his followers, and the University of Paris has issued a volume of his aphorisms for medical students. In his "Diate Oxeōn," or "Treatment of Acute Diseases," Hippocrates describes the symptoms of varied ailments, and prescribes for cases requiring sweet, strong or black wines, hydromel (honey and water) or oxymel (honey and vinegar); all of which were to be prepared, as the French writers note, from "fresh-pressed grape-juice" before alcoholic ferment had begun. Of their action, Hippocrates says: "The sweet affects the head less, attacking the brain more feebly, while it evacuates the bowels more. There is a difference, also, as to their nutritive powers, between undiluted wine and undiluted honey (or syrup). If a man drink double the quantity of pure wine he will find himself no more strengthened than from half the same quantity of honey-syrup." Hippocrates lays down the precept that no medicinal use of intoxicating wine, as his French commentators declare, is allowable, except as an anæsthetic in cases of extreme pain; citing in his "Aphorisms" (vii, 48) 'strangury," or inflammation of the bladder, as an illustration. Athenæus, a general literary collector, cites the following as a prescription by Hippocrates: "Take wine-syrup (*oinon gleukon*), either mixed with water and heated, especially that called *protropos* (grape-dripping) of the sweet Lesbian; for the syrup-sweet wine (*glukazōn oinos*) does not oppress the head and affect the mind, but purges (*diachoreei*) more easily than sweet wine (*oinou edeos*)." Dioscorides, writing on Materia Medica (*Hyles Iatrikes*) devoted Book v of his work to the medicinal properties of various preparations made from fresh grape-juice, stating (c. 9) that "sweet wine (*oinos edus*) is flatulent (*pneumatikos*) in the stomach and bowels;" again (c. 11) he says that "jellied wines (*oinoi pacheis*) are clogging to the digestive organs," while "the thin wines (*oinoi leptoi*) are "less flesh-producing;" and yet again (c. 15), that "honied wine (*oinos melitetes*) is given in chronic fevers (*chroniois puretois*) to those having weak digestive organs." Aristæus, about A. D. 100, in treating "on the causes, signs and cures" of varied diseases, makes these statements: "The use of wine causes *angina pectoris*, hemorrhage from the head, inflammation of the liver, insanity, paralysis, apolexy; and is the most frequent cause of ordinary disease." He adds this warning to medical practitioners in prescribing it: "Wine is a medicament in cholera and syncope, though its use is attended with danger,"—unwise medical prescriptions, especially of wine, being then as now a chief lure to intemperance. Galen, the most comprehensive and voluminous of all the ancient medical writers, born about A. D. 130, and eminent at Rome for two succeeding generations, is full in his statements as to the cause and cure of intemperance. In his treatise on "Simple Remedies," alluding, as Aristæus does, to danger from medical prescriptions, he says (B. ix, c. 215): "Wine is the second rank (*taxis*) in the heating prescriptions (*thermainontōn*); old wine is of the third, and preserved grape-juice (*gleukos*) is of the first rank,"—a recommendation in accord with that of the most eminent English and American physicians, that brandies be burned when used medicinally, the natural ingredients of grape-juice, not the alcohol, being serviceable. Galen's statement is, as the connection shows, that simple grape-syrup is the first and best in common medical prescriptions.

It is a fact too much overlooked that both French and German medical science has called for repeated editions of these ancient Greek medical writers, and that the advance of tested hygienic and therapeutic agents has constrained men of eminence, who could hazard fidelity in taking their stand against the social drinking customs, to repeat, and with growing emphasis, the warnings of these men, whose science entered into the philosophy that culminated in the schools of Plato and Aristotle, and that ruled both the Roman kingdom and Republic, as Pliny traced it, from Numa to the Catoes. Opening the volumes of Plato, the fact is significant that he makes the philosophy of his books on "Laws" turn upon the discussion of the principle that had ruled legislation in repressing habits of intemperance. Three advocates of special systems, the Spartan military rule of forcible punishment, the Athenian freedom ruled by education, and the balanced Cretan system, recognizing the necessity of both combined, all tend to "Prohibition," at once inculcated in childhood and enforced by legal enactment, as well as by public sentiment prompting to personal abstinence from intoxicants. This discussion fills the first two of Plato's 12 books, since truth on this question of legislation establishes the principle of all legislation against vice and crime, intemperance being the chief source of all vices and crimes. The

Spartan states that Sparta's law banished intoxicating wine from festal banquets, and so guarded public order. But the barbarity of pure military rule is seen in the method of awakening disgust at intemperance by the custom afterwards thus stated by Plutarch: "Sometimes they made the helots drink till they were intoxicated, and in that condition led them into the public halls, to show the young men what drunkenness was."

The Athenian, after long discussion, at last admits: "Shall we not lay down a law in the first place that boys shall not taste wine at all till they are 18 years of age?"—thus proposing a prohibition against the sale of intoxicating liquors to "minors." Finally, while urging still that moral sentiment should rule mature men, the penalty of loss of office ruling in political appointments, the Athenian allows that enactments to this effect should be made and enforced: "That no one when in camp is to taste of that drink, but to subsist on water during all that period; that in the city neither a male nor a female servant should ever taste it; nor should magistrates during the year of their office, nor pilots, nor Judges when engaged in their official business, nor any citizen who goes to any council to deliberate upon any matter of moment." Going yet farther, since the idea of personal liberty and of sumptuary laws, always urged by *dealers* in intoxicants, was rife in Athens as it is in American cities, the Athenian adds: "Many other cases one might mention in which wine ought not to be drunk by those who possess mind, and share in framing laws: so that, according to this reasoning, there is to no state any need of many vineyards, but other kinds of agriculture should be required by law, and those providing every article of diet."

No American can read these illustrations and conclusions urged by the ablest minds the world ever produced, whose wisdom all succeeding generations have recognized, and not be struck with the fact that Prohibitory law, a just defence from the illegitimate claim of a few unscrupulous dealers that they have a right to make money by corrupting youth, seducing husbands, impoverishing fathers, compelling the chief and worst service of police, exacting the main tax on all citizens for the support of Courts,—that Prohibitory law is demanded by justice, by duty to families and by the safety of the very life of communities. This ancient philosophy took final form in the treatises of Aristotle on Ethics, Politics and Economics, whose sway ruled the Roman Republic and guarded for centuries its virtue. Aristotle's definition is given as the clue at the opening of this historic survey. In his "Meteroics," from whose treasures of ancient physical science Sir William Hamilton has drawn, Aristotle makes various statements as to the properties of wines. After speaking of different liquids, as of water completely evaporated by heat and of milk converted into whey and curd (iv, 3), he says (iv, 7): "There is a certain wine, the unfermented gleukos, which may be both congealed (*pegnutei*) by cold and evaporated (*epsetai*) by heat," statements which settle the doubt whether unfermented wine has existed, and at the same time prove that it was sought by Greek sages and physicians as a safeguard against intemperance. In his "Problems" he asks: "Why are persons much intoxicated stupefied, while those slightly intoxicated are like madmen? Why do men stupified by wine fall on their backs, while men crazed by wine fall on their faces? Why are wine-drinkers made dizzy, and their vision affected? Why are persons fond of sweet wine (*gleukon oinon*) not wine-bibbers (*oinophlyges*), or overcome by wine?" Among hygienic questions are these: "Why are those who drink wine slightly diluted subject to headaches, while wine much diluted produces vomiting and purging? Why do those who drink undiluted wine have more headache next day than those who drink diluted wine? Why does wine greatly diluted produce vomiting, while wine alone does not? Why does sweet wine counteract the effect of undiluted wine? Why is oil beneficial in intoxication?" No wonder men of science see the mastery of *facts* in the very questions of Aristotle. His replies indicate logical induction from facts, as this suggestion on the last question: "Because oil is diuretic, and prepares the body for the discharge of the liquor." In his "Ethics," Aristotle states this double law of temperance as *abstinence* from intoxicants: "By *abstaining* from sensual indulgences we become temperate; and when we have become so, we are best able to abstain from them,"—which double law he applies to varied indulgences (B. ii, c. 2, sections 6, 7, 8), insisting that *bodily* restraint must be enforced by the *physical* restraint of law. As to the criminality of inebriates, he writes thus: "He who is under the influence of drunkenness is seen to act not through ignorance, but with ignorance" (iii, 7 : 15). In his "Politics," he states that "public tables" or eating-houses are to be controlled by statutes (vii, 12), and he urges that the Spartans erred as to the end sought, making "war and victory the end of government," and that hence in peace the spirit of indulgence went to excess. Hence Aristotle urges that as parents *restrain first the bodily acts* of children, and *then give moral precepts*, so Prohibitory statutes should "restrain the appetites for the sake of the mind" (vii, 15).

"Temperance" was understood by the voluptuous Herod, listening to John, the herald of Jesus. It ruled in Jesus from the hour he made "fresh wine," like "fresh fruit" (*kalon* designating both), till the night he initiated his supper in the cup filled with "the fruit of the vine;" and though sleepless till morn, and faint when on the cross, "when he tasted the wine" offered him, he "would not drink of it." This "temperance" is the antidote for the sin of drunkenness that is constantly urged in the preaching and the writings of Paul addressed to men of all nations, while the medical knowledge of Luke, his constant companion, as a Greek physician, and the divine inspiration of the great Christian apostle, were reciprocally interchanged. It guided the thought and prompted the duty of faithful Christian leaders in each succeeding century; as a careful study of their writings and their direct citations in meeting corruption in courts and heathen popular customs abundantly show. Such preachers and teachers were Irenaeus in Southern France and Justin and Clement at Alexandria (Egypt) in the 2d Century; Zeno in Northern Italy, Tertullian at Carthage and Origen at Alexandria in the 3d Century; Hilarius in France, Ambrose in Italy, Lactantius, the teacher of Constantine's sons, and Chrysostom, the court preacher at Constantinople, Basil in Asia Minor, Ephiphanius in Cyprus, Eusebius, the church historian, and Cyril in Palestine, Athanasius at Alexandria and Arnobius at Carthage, that galaxy of master-spirits raised up together in the 4th Century to meet the worldly spirit that was crowding into the Christian churches under the first Christian Emporers; and again, Theodoret on the Euphrates, Jerome in Palestine and Augustine at Rome and Carthage, needed in the 5th Century to echo and add to the voices of the past. It awoke again in the Middle Ages, when Popes and Bishops, monks and evangelists were called to stem the tide of the "heavy-headed revelry" pictured by Shakespeare in his "Hamlet," growing out of demoralizing customs hereditary in Germany from the days of Cæsar and Tacitus; customs of Central Europe against which Charlemagne struggled by moral appeal and by Imperial edicts. These reasonings are embodied in the volumes of Thomas Aquinas, master of all learning, Hebrew, Christian and Mohammedan, Grecian, Roman and ecclesiastical; who, as the great teacher of the century, goes back to Aristotle, translating as authoritative entire treatises.

That same science and philosphy enter into the modern legislation of Europe; Montesquieu in his "Spirit of Laws," and Rollin in his "Ancient History," going back to the same authority in rousing the spirit of political and religious reform which has led the ablest statesmen to become abstainers from intoxicants, and to inaugurate restrictive laws tending more and more to the Grecian science and the Roman virtue that ruled for centuries in Prohibitory statutes. The successive steps of English political reform, traced by Whewell, the author of the "History of the Inductive Sciences," in his "Platonic Dialogues" and his "Morality and Polity," directly back to the Grecian philosophy of Aristotle, so far as they relate to laws for overcoming intemperance, brought together in a prize essay by James Smith, M. A., of Scotland (published at London in 1875), indicate that Grecian and Roman prohibitive statutes are "natural," and hence "divine law." Under the reign of Henry VII, from 1485 to 1509, an act of Parliament (11 Henry VII) was passed, providing : "It shall be lawful to two Justices to reject and put away common ale-selling in towns and places where they think convenient." On this principle of practical philosophy, under Edward VI, in 1552 (5 and 6 Edward VI), statutes of enforcement were added, whose effective agency is thus cited in the instructions to the Lord Keeper and his aids by the Circuit Judges in 1602, late in the reign of Elizabeth: "That they should ascertain for the Queen's information how many ale-houses the Justices of the Peace had pulled down, so that the good Justices might be rewarded and the evils removed." In 1839 Lord Brougham, in the House of Lords, urging the enforcement of these old statutes, used almost the very language of the Grecian and Roman reasoning, exclaiming: "To what good was it that the Legislature should pass laws to punish crimes, or that their lordships should occupy themselves in improving the morals of the people by giving them education! What could be the use of sowing a little seed here and plucking up a weed there, if these beer-shops were to be continued, that they might go on to sow the seed of immorality broadcast over the land!"

The thorough student of American polity, founded, as recognized by English, French and early American statesmen, on the very model of Grecian science and Roman jurisprudence, must be self-blinded if he does not see and accept the logic of Prohibitory as well as restrictive laws as to the unmitigated public evil of intemperance. Under Elizabeth and James I, at the very origin of the first American colonies, Lord Coke's spirit, first as Speaker of the House of Commons, then as Chief-Justice of the Court of Common Pleas, and finally as Chief-Justice of the King's Bench, had instilled into the minds of the people of England the ideas of representative government, which the leaders in all the colonies carried with them. Under Louis XIV, Montesquieu in his "Esprit des Lois" (issued in 1748) had traced back to Aristotle's principles the moral power, the popular "virtue," secured under the long-lived Roman Republic, gradually overshadowed by the military rule of Northern Europe in the Middle Ages, but regained most fully in the British Government, ruled as it then was under George II by the will of the people's representatives in the House of Commons.

That "spirit of laws," as certain to rule as gravity in preserving stable institutions, has ruled and must rule Americans. To confirm and emphasize this fact, Paley, writing during the American Revolution, had no other resort in opposing the American spirit than directly to deny the principles of Aristotle as to popular representative rule; while in striking contrast Whewell, the author of the "History of the Inductive Sciences," in his "Morality and Polity," issued about the time of the war for American Union, begins by re-affirming the science of Aristotle; while, also, Gladstone in England and Guizot in France have in their profound studies avowed the consistent rule of that science in American polity. In legislation against intemperance, Grecian science, Roman virtue and British precedents assure the equity and therefore the triumph of Prohibitory statutes.

G. W. SAMSON.

Holland.[1]—About 40 years ago a Dutch clergyman, Rev. Dr. Adema von Scheltema, became interested in the temperance movement in England. Taking the pledge himself he immediately set to work to spread the cause among his countrymen. He has translated into Dutch numerous temperance books and pamphlets, including Dr. Richardson's "Temperance Lesson-Book," a copy of which is now to be found, with the Bible, in every prisoner's cell in Holland. In a recent letter he says that the number of hymns and songs translated by him is in excess of 1,400. These include most of Sankey's, Philip Phillips's, 627 hymns for the Dutch Sunday-schools in America, and the hymns used in the juvenile branch of the Good Templar Order. Dr. Scheltema adds that he is beginning to reap some fruits from his long labors. Temperance work has been inaugurated among the children of the various localities, but the aversion to administering the pledge to them is so strong that it is difficult to effect organization. A lady, Miss Velthuysen, is performing excellent work in this field, gathering the children together and instructing them about the effects of alcohol upon the human system.

---

[1] The editor is indebted to Miss Charlotte A. Gray of Belgium, and to Joseph Malins of Manchester, Eng.

She received the first impulse from the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the United States and has been greatly encouraged and aided by the Band of Hope Union of England.

The early movement in the Continental countries against the "abuse" of the stronger liquors, resulting chiefly from the efforts of Robert Baird, had some development in Holland. In 1842 a "Vereeniging tot Afschaffing van sterken Drank," or Temperance League, was started, but not on a total abstinence basis; and it still has a nominal existence, with Baron de Lynden as a leading spirit. In consequence of the efforts of this society and other influences, a law similar in some respects to certain so-called restrictive measures in the United States was enacted. At that time Holland had no less than 40,000 dramshops licensed to sell spirits. The new law provided that many of the licenses should be discontinued, and that upon the death of license-holders their houses should not be re-licensed, and that unmarried women, all persons in the employ of the Government, all brothel-keepers, etc., should not receive licenses to sell liquors. Within two years 12,000 drinking-places were closed, and the number of dramshops was reduced from one for every 89 inhabitants in 1880 to one for every 125 inhabitants in 1882. In 1887 the aggregate number had been still farther reduced to 28,000—a decrease of 19,000 in seven years. The reduction is to continue until the year 1901, when it is estimated that only 12,000 will remain, or one to 250 inhabitants in villages and one to 500 in the larger towns. But while the number of rumshops has been reduced fully 40 per cent., there has been no considerable diminution in the quantity of liquors consumed. From the year 1860 the consumption per capita steadily increased until 1877, when it reached the maximum point. The following figures of the per capita consumption are official:

	SPIRITS, liters.	BEER, liters.	WINE, liters.
1860	6	12	2
1877	10	20	2
1886	9	20	2

Home Protection.—This term, as applied to the temperance movement, originated in 1876, when Miss Frances E. Willard, then Corresponding Secretary of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, used it as the title of an address before the Woman's Congress in St. George's Hall, Philadelphia, to indicate woman's ballot as the most potent weapon for Prohibitionists. The address was repeated with amplifications at Henry C. Bowen's 4th of July celebration at Woodstock in 1877, and was published in the *Independent* and also in a "Home Protection Manual," of which Miss Willard gave away 12,000 copies. The Home Protection movement, as it was called, spread through the W. C. T. U.; and every National Convention of that organization since 1877 has made some expression favorable to woman's ballot, demanding enfranchisement not so much as a matter of abstract right as for the sake of advancing home protection by saloon destruction. In 1882 the old-line Prohibition party held a convention in Farwell Hall, Chicago, in response to a call in which the names of John B. Finch, George W. Bain, A. J. Jutkins and Frances E. Willard were associated with those of Gideon T. Stewart and other pioneers in the party agitation. The demand for woman's ballot, always a feature of the Prohibition platform, was repeated and emphasized, and the name of the party was changed to "Prohibition and Home Protection Party," Miss Willard and Mrs. Sallie F. Chapin being made members-at-large of its National Committee. At Pittsburgh in 1884, the words "Home Protection" were dropped from the party's name, greatly to the regret of many women. But the principle represented by the movement was not repudiated.

The term "Home Protection" has a wider significance, however, than that given it by its application to the particular movement above alluded to. It expressively defines one of the main purposes of all Prohibitionists, whether supporters or opponents of Woman Suffrage.

Hops.—The flowers of the female hop plant (*Humulus Lupulus*). Hops are now considered indispensable in the brewing process—at least in any honestly-managed brewing process,—although they were not systematically cultivated for brewing purposes until near the beginning of the 17th Century. They check the acetous fermentation, and impart to the beer the bitter aroma that is relished by drinkers. The stupefying effect of malt liquors is produced chiefly by the hops. The beers richest in hops are the ones most esteemed by connoisseurs: hence larger quantities of hops are used in export beers than in any other kinds.

Substitutes for hops are employed by dishonest brewers, especially highly poisonous alkaloids like strychnine and picrotoxine. Picric acid is also a common substitute. C. A. Crampton, in a very conservative report on adulterations of liquors made to the United States Department of Agriculture in 1887, says: "Picrotoxine and picric acid have undoubtedly been found in beers, and probably more cases of such adulteration would occasionally have been discovered were it not for the difficulty of the analysis and the small quantity of matter required for imparting a bitter taste."[1]

The total domestic beer product of the United States is now about 25,000,000 barrels annually; and since 2 lbs. is a moderate estimate of the amount of hops needed for making a barrel of beer, it is apparent that the aggregate consumption of hops in this country should be at least 50,000,000 lbs. annually, if our brewers use honest methods (see FARMERS). There are no official returns of the annual hop-crops. In 1880 there were 26,546,378 lbs. of hops grown according to the Census; the imports in that year amounted to 497,243 lbs., and the exports to 9,001,128 lbs , leaving 17,952,493 lbs. consumed by United States brewers.

It is estimated that in 1889 the hop-yield of the United States was about 36,000,000 lbs.[2] During the year ending June 30, 1889, we imported 4,176,158 lbs. and exported 12,589,262 lbs. of domestic hops and 284,344 lbs. of foreign hops.

The principal hop-growing State is New York, which in 1380 yielded 21,628,931 lbs. of the entire product of 26,546,378 lbs. The New York counties of Oneida, Otsego, Schoharie and Madison produce more than half of the whole crop of the country. The States of California, Oregon and Washington, which in 1880 produced 2,391,725 lbs., now rival New York: in 1889 these three States grew about 16,000,000 lbs., as against 18,000,000 in New York. The other States in which hop culture is of some importance are Wisconsin, Michigan, Vermont, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania and Maine.

Official returns show the hop-yields for several European countries in recent years to have been as follows:[3]

	1885. lbs.	1886. lbs.
Great Britain	57,027,040	86.928,128
Germany	73,195,145	66.584,432
France	10,891,606	9,071,709
Austria	12,796.380	10,852,144
Netherlands	403,442	709,881

Humphrey, Heman.—Born in West Simsbury, Conn., March 26, 1779, and died in Pittsfield, Mass., April 3, 1861. He graduated from Yale College in 1805. He was pastor of the Congregational Church in Fairfield, Conn., for ten years and held the same position in Pittsfield, Mass., for five years. In 1813 he drew up a report to the Fairfield Association of Ministers which is believed to have been the first temperance tract published in America. He was elected President of Amherst College in 1823, and continued in that office until 1845. In 1810 he preached a series of six sermons on intemperance, and in 1813 published in the *Panoplist* six articles on the "Cause, Origin, Effects and Remedy of Intemperance in the United States." His "Parallel between Intemperance and the Slave-trade" was an able arraignment of both evils. The "Debates of Conscience with a Distiller, Wholesale Dealer and Retailer" was widely circulated. As early as 1833 he opposed all license laws. "It is as plain to me," he said, "as the sun in a clear summer sky, that the license laws of our country constitute one of the main pillars on which the stupendous fabric of intemperance now rests."

Hunt, Thomas Poage.—Born in Charlotte County, Va., in 1794, and died in Wyoming Valley, Pa., Dec. 5, 1876. He studied theology and was licensed to preach in 1824. In 1830, after holding the pastorates of several churches in Virginia and North Carolina, he accepted the position of Agent for the North Carolina State Temperance Society. He removed to Philadelphia in 1836, and to Wyoming Valley, Pa., in 1839. From

---

[1] Report of the Department of Agriculture for 1887, p. 193.

[2] "Tariff Reform" Documents, vol. 3, No. 7.

[3] Report of the United States Department of Agriculture for 1888, pp. 472-3.

1840 to 1845 he was agent for Lafayette College. He was a pioneer in the temperance lecture field, and during the earlier years of the movement he traveled through Pennsylvania and parts of the other Middle States, preaching and delivering addresses on intemperance. Through his persuasions Dr. Charles Jewett was induced to become a public advocate of temperance. His exposure of frauds in the liquor traffic, published in 1839, created a stir. He had procured from London a number of brewers' guides and receipt-books, and his revelation of some of the secrets of the trade shocked the consumers and disgusted the vendors of alcoholic beverages, his exposures of liquor adulterations being probably the first authentic ones made in this country. Originally a slaveholder, Mr. Hunt had emancipated his slaves long before the Civil War, and at its outbreak, although advanced in years, he entered the army as chaplain of a Pennsylvania regiment. In this position he was enabled to reform many soldiers from the drink habit. In later years he was familiarly known as "Father Hunt."

Idaho.—See Index.

Idiocy.—The detrimental action of alcohol extends to every part of the human organism, and its influence upon the brain betrays itself by the well-known mental symptoms of intoxication. The proximate cause of those symptons is the congestion of the cerebral blood-vessels and their pressure upon the delicate tissue of the brain. Confusion of ideas and the stupor following the crisis of the stimulant-fever subside after the partial elimination of the poison, but leave an after-effect which is apt to become culminative and hereditary. The membranes of the brain, by the frequent repetition of alcoholic congestion, become thickened, the blood vessels distorted and often so brittle that they are liable to be ruptured and induce apoplexy or that habitual mental torpor and disinclination to intellectual efforts so characteristic of habitual drunkards. In its hereditary transmission, that deterioration of the cerebral organism often assumes the form of permanent idiocy. "We have a far larger experience," says the physiologist Carpenter, "of the results of habitual alcoholic excess than we have in regard to any other nervine stimulant, and all such experience is decidedly in favor of the hereditary transmission of that acquired perversion of the normal nutrition of the nervous system which it has induced. That this manifests itself sometimes in a congenital idiocy, sometimes in a predisposition to insanity which requires but a very slight exciting cause to develop it, and sometimes in a strong craving for alcoholic drinks which the unhappy subject of it strives in vain to resist, is the concurrent testimony of all who have directed their attention to the inquiry."

In a report to the Massachusetts Commission on Idiocy, Dr. S. G. Howe states that "out of 359 idiots the condition of whose progenitors was ascertained, 99 were the children of drunkards. But this does not tell the whole story by any means. By drunkard is meant a person who is a notorious and habitual sot. . . . By pretty careful inquiry, as to the number of idiots of the lowest class whose parents were known to be temperate persons, it was found that not one-quarter can be so considered." Judge R. C. Pitman, in quoting the insanity statistics of eastern North America, justly remarks that the suggestiveness of such reports is even more ominous than their direct significance. "If in so many cases *idiocy* was produced," he says, "in how vastly many more is there reason to believe that degrees of degeneracy falling short of this recognized status resulted! When idiocy is reached, then comes extinction; but through how many generations and with what wide-spread collaterals may imbecility of the physical, mental and moral nature, or of all combined, propagate itself!"

That conjecture is confirmed by the verdict of the best modern authorities on the causes of mental diseases. Dr. H. Morel, in his work on Human Degeneration ("Des Dégénérescences de l'Espéce Humaine"), attributes the marasmus of modern civilization chiefly to "the abuse of alcoholic liquors and of certain narcotics, such as opium. Under the influence of these poisonous agents there have been produced perversions so great in the functions of the nervous system that the result, as we have demonstrated, is the chief factor of degeneration in modern times, whether in its direct influence or by hereditary transmission in the child." In a memorandum upon "Alcohol as a Cause of Vitiation of Human Stock," Dr. Nathan Allen remarks that "A prolific cause of degeneration is the common habit of taking alcohol into the system, usually as the basis of spirits, wine or beer. . . . If this process is often repeated, the lower propensities are strengthened by exercise until, by and by, they come to act automatically, while the restraining powers, or the will, weakened by disuse, are practically nullified. The man is no longer under the control of his voluntary powers, but has come under the sway of automatic agencies which operate almost as independently of his volition as the beating of his heart. . . . Moreover the children of parents whose systems were tainted by alcoholic poison do start in life under great disadvantage. While they inherit strong animal propensities and morbid appetites and tendencies, constantly craving indulgence, they have weak restraining faculties." Before the Parliamentary Committee on Habitual Intemperance, Dr. E. R. Mitchell recorded this condition, that the "children of habitual drunkards are in a larger proportion idiotic than other children, and in a larger degree liable to the ordinary forms of acquired insanity,—*i. e.*, the insanity coming on in later life."

It is a suggestive fact that in at least 70 of 100 cases, hereditary insanity is transmitted from *male* ancestors, *i. e.*, from the alcoholized sex. Adding the cases of idiocy inherited from intemperate mothers (as the gin-drinking viragos of the British manufacturing towns), it would be hardly an over-estimate to assume that 75 per cent. of all victims of mental disease owe their affliction to the direct or indirect influence of the alcohol habit.

Felix L. Oswald.

Illinois.—See Index.

Illiteracy.—In 1880, according to the United States Census, in a total population of 50,155,783 (31,046,421 of this number being 15 years old or over), there were 5,107,993 white and colored persons aged 15 years and upward who were unable to write. Of these 5,107,993 illiterates, 1,088,503 were white males, 1,351,383 were white females, 1,269,619 were colored males, and 1,398,488 were colored females. The States of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia, and the Territory of New Mexico, each returned 25 per cent. or more of the male inhabitants aged 15 years and upward as unable to write. The great prevalence of illiteracy in these and other Southern States is a legacy from the peculiar social system of former years. The close relationship existing between illiteracy on the one hand and extreme poverty, improvidence, intemperance, etc., on the other, is established by ordinary observation as well as by industrial and other statistics for all the States above named. However striking and gratifying may be the improvement enjoyed by the educated members of the emancipated race, and whatever may be said as to the responsibility for the illiteracy of the majority, it cannot be denied that the condition of the colored illiterates is lamentable and threatening from every point of view, and especially from the temperance standpoint. These illiterates have contributed by far the greater part of the formidable anti-Prohibition majorities in typical Southern States and cities where contests have been held. The opposition to negro suffrage that has been manifested by certain classes of whites in the South is not shared by the saloon element when Prohibitory Amendment or Local Option issues are to be decided. It has always been seen that the presence of a large element of ignorant voters enhances the chances of perpetuating the liquor traffic. In the contest in Atlanta in 1887, the Prohibition cause was supported with practical unanimity by the religious and moral interests, and by a majority of the intelligent and thrifty citizens, both colored and white; but the ignorant vote was cast solidly for the saloon, chiefly through the instrumentality of a vulgar mountebank, "Yellowstone Kit," who had obtained great influence over the illiterate and superstitious negroes; and the repeal of the Prohibition policy of Atlanta was the work of this man and his ignorant followers. Illiteracy and credulity are interchangeable words, and in every community the ignorant vote is under the control of unscrupulous demagogues, who are ready to resort to any pretences or deceptions that will be effective. In the South the pretences and deceptions with which the ignorant negroes are plied are of the most scandalous nature; these people are systematically taught that Prohibition laws will deprive them of their liberty, and that the ultimate aim of the Prohibitionists is to restore slavery; they are told that Abraham Lincoln was a staunch opponent of Prohibition. The majorities against Prohibition in typical black counties[1] are almost wholly due to representations such as these.

The colored illiterates, however, are far more susceptible to religious and similar influences than the ignorant whites, and the appeals of negro clergymen and educators in behalf of temperance and Prohibition have frequently been productive of very encouraging results. On the other hand, in localities where illiteracy prevails among the whites, the situation is desperate indeed. The mountain counties of Kentucky are believed to be among the most benighted regions of the United States. The county of Perry is a specimen one. It is populated almost exclusively by whites, and in 1890 there was not a school or a church within its borders. In 20 years 500 murders were committed in this county, yet only one murderer was executed within that period. The whiskey traffic was a fruitful cause of this illiteracy and these crimes, many illicit stills being in operation.[2] In every community the freest and most dangerous drinkers are, as a rule, the illiterate and semi-illiterate citizens, who also constitute a very large proportion of the anti-Prohibition element—a proportion so large, in fact, as to be distinctively responsible for the anti-Prohibition idea and following as a whole, in the same sense that the religious and enlightened classes are distinctively responsible for Prohibition sentiment and triumphs.

In the States where the Prohibition movement has been most successful, the percentages of illiteracy are comparatively insignificant. These States are Iowa, Kansas, Maine, North Dakota, South Dakota and Vermont. In Iowa, according to the Census returns for 1880, only 4 per cent. of the male citizens 15 years and over were unable to write; in Kansas, 5 per cent.; in Maine, 5 per cent.; in the Dakotas, 4 per cent., and in Vermont, 7 per cent.; while in the whole country the percentage was 15. A small percentage of illiteracy does not as yet, however, necessarily imply a Prohibition preponderance, since the plausible arguments against Prohibition and for the various compromise schemes divide public sentiment among the educated. Thus, in the State of Nebraska, where only 3 per cent. of the males 15 years of age and upwards were unable to write in 1880, Prohibition has encountered bitter opposition, and the High License idea has prevailed. It is also true that Prohibition has sometimes carried in communities where the percentage of illiteracy is large, as in many counties of Georgia and other Southern States. These apparently anomalous successes are attributed in nearly all instances to the determined work and superior power of the educated citizens, whose understanding of the necessity of Prohibition laws has been stimulated by practical object lessons, and whose will the illiterate masses, without leadership or organization, have been unable to overcome. But it has invariably been found that conditions are most promising for the saloon where there is a formidable ignorant vote, and that the ability of the saloon leaders to secure the united support of this vote is dependent only upon shrewdness, unscrupulousness and organization.

Immigration.—See FOREIGNERS.

Imports and Exports.—The import and export trade in alcoholic liquors seriously complicates the Prohibition problem in the United States. Large amounts of capital are invested in it by Americans and foreigners. The total value of imported liquor exceeds $10,000,000 annually, to which must be added customs duties aggregating nearly $8,000,000. These imports include nearly all the more expensive brands of wines, beer and spirits used by Americans, and to cut off the import trade means to deprive the rich of the means of gratifying their particular tastes. The right to regulate foreign commerce rests exclusively with Congress, and no State can prohibit the importation of liquors without the consent of Congress. By an act of Congress passed in August, 1890, Prohibition States are permitted to exclude foreign as well as domestic liquors, and the right to attack the import trade is therefore temporarily conceded. At present, however, there is only one seaboard State (Maine) that chooses to exercise this privilege.

---

[1] Those desiring details may compare the county votes on the Prohibitory Amendments in Texas and Tennessee with the county population returns by races for those States, as given in the "Compendium of the 10th Census," vol. 2, pp. 370-4.

[2] See the New York *Sun* for Aug. 8, 1890, and the New York *Evening Post* for Aug. 9, 1890.

IMPORTS.

The chief centers of the import traffic in liquors are the ports of New York, Boston and San Francisco. For the year ending June 30, 1889, the total value of malt, vinous and spirituous liquors imported at New York was $8,198,588; at Boston, $654,829, and at San Francisco, $640,207; while the aggregate value for the entire country was $10,996,849—so that these three ports did nearly nine-tenths of the import business.

The following table shows in detail the imports and their values, and the duties collected, for the year ending June 30, 1889:

	Quantities.	Values.	Duty.
Malt Liquors:	*Galls.*		
In bottles or jugs...	1,151,065	$956,243	$391,853.48
Not in bots. or jugs.	1,373,616	405,747	271,483.60
Totals.........	2,524,681	$1,361,990	$663,337.08
Spirits, Distilled, and Spirituous compounds:	*Proof Galls.*		
Brandy	400,089	$1,076,265	$806,512.87
All others..........	1,127,458	851,822	2,136,735.21
Totals.........	1,527,547	$1,928,087	$2,943,248.08
Wines:			
Champagne and other sparkling doz.	315,870	$4,254,413	$2,181,693.65
Still Wines:			
In casks.... galls.	3,078,554	2,126,548	1,998,121.06
In bottles....doz.	260,026	1,325,811	
Totals.........		$7,706,772	$4,179,814.71
Grand totals....		10,996,849	7,786,399.87[1]

It is of interest to note that the value of brandy and champagne was nearly half as much as the combined value of all imported liquors.

In the following table are given, for a series of years, the values of and duties levied on malt, spirituous and vinous liquors *withdrawn for consumption*:[1]

Year Ending June 30.	Malt Liquors.		Distilled Spirits.		Wines.		All Liquors.	
	Values.	Duty.	Values.	Duty.	Values.	Duty.	Values.	Duty.
1880......	$678,507	$283,296	$1,751,134	$2,788,531	$5,649,033	$3,091,926	$8,078,674	$6,163,753
1885......	1,111,407	546,999	1,873,926	2,943,773	6,340,415	3,665,792	9,325,748	7,156,564
1886......	1,206,257	585,102	1,826,059	2,834,696	6,753,472	3,774,349	9,785,788	7,194,147
1887......	1,267,309	614,187	1,909,900	2,939,923	7,013,737	3,848,133	10,190,946	7,402 243
1888......	1,353,890	666,666	1,972,287	2,981,772	7,310,190	4,014,806	10,636,367	7,663,244
1889......	1,322,258	663,337	1,902,880	2,943,248	7,713,652	4,179,815	10,938,790	7,786,400

The only countries from which we receive considerable quantities of malt liquors are England, Ireland, Germany, Scotland, Austria-Hungary and Canada, the values of malt liquors imported from these countries in 1889 having been: England, $772,311; Ireland, $384,083; Germany, $125,022; Scotland, $40,125; Austria-Hungary, $26,517; Canada, $12,129. The other countries shipping beer to us were: Mexico, $819; Sweden and

---

[1] Duties are collected at the time of the withdrawal of merchandise from the warehouse. The duties given in this table are the duties assessed on the values of liquors so withdrawn from the warehouse during the year ($10,938,789.88), not on the total values of all liquors imported ($10,996,849). Consequently there remains an aggregate value of $58,059 on which duty was not collected during the year.

[1] See note to preceding table.

Norway, $472; France, $211; Netherlands, $162; Denmark, $108; Belgium, $10; Cuba, $8; Hawaiian Islands, $7, and Newfoundland $6.

In the import trade in spirits and spirituous compounds, nearly every country with which we have commercial relations is represented. In 1889 the total imports of brandy were valued at $1,076,265; and from France alone the brandy imported had a value of $977,318. The imports of brandy from England were valued at $40,372, from Belgium at $17,873, from Canada at $14,276, from Germany at $10,734 and from the Danish West Indies at $4,513. The following table gives the values of distilled liquors (including brandy) for the countries from which the importations in 1889 exceeded $5,000:

France	$1,101,050
England	199,052
Netherlands	152,850
British West Indies	108,434
Germany	76,812
Scotland	58,947
Belgium	40,595
Canada	39,702
Ireland	38,805
China	32,743
Cuba	15,645
Danish West Indies	14,332
Italy	12,317
Hong-Kong	8,955
Austria-Hungary	7,577
Switzerland	6,474
All other countries	13,797

France also leads in the import trade in wines. The champagne imported from France in 1889 was valued at $3,991,358; while the champagne imported from all other countries had a value of only $263,055, of which that imported from Belgium was valued at $167,045, that from Germany at $45,698 and that from England at $41,725. Even in still wines France takes the lead, having sent us $1,074,520 worth in 1889, although Germany was a close competitor, shipping still wines valued at $1,070,203. The following table includes all the countries from which wines valued in excess of $5,000 were imported in 1889:

France	$5,065,878
Germany	1,115,901
Spain	682,427
Belgium	196,887
England	191,756
Italy	136,737
Austria-Hungary	105,205
Portugal	89,545
Netherlands	31,466
Cuba	30.127
Azore, Madeira and Cape Verde Islands	12,436
Canada	11,908
Switzerland	6.401
All other countries	30,098

No foreign liquors of any kind, intended for general beverage use,[1] are allowed to enter the United States free of duty, although no duty is charged on spirits manufactured by United States distillers, shipped to foreign ports to delay payment of the Internal Revenue taxes and then brought back. In 1888 there were 2,636,756 gallons of such spirits brought back, valued at $2,686,414; and in 1889 there were 1,933,712 gallons, valued at $2,027,844. The duty on ale, beer and porter is 40 cents per gallon when the liquor is in bottles or jugs, and 35 cents per gallon when in casks. A duty of $2.50 per proof gallon is charged on alcohol, on brandy, cordials, liqueurs, arrack, absinthe, *kirschwasser*, ratafia, whiskey, gin, rum, etc. On champagne and all other sparkling wines in bottles the rate of duty is $2 per dozen half-pint bottles, $4 per dozen pint bottles and $8 per dozen quart bottles. Still wines (including ginger wine or ginger cordials or vermuth) pay 50 cents per gallon when in casks and $1.60 per dozen quart bottles when in bottles.

Besides liquors, the United States levies customs duties on various materials required by liquor manufacturers. Barley pays 30 cents per bushel; barley malt, 45 cents per bushel; chemicals, different rates, separately fixed for different articles; casks, 30 per cent.; bottles containing sparkling wines, brandy or other spirituous liquors, from 1 to 1½ cent per lb.; glucose, ¾ cent per lb.; hops, 15 cents per lb.; rice (flour, meal and broken), ¼ cent per lb.; prune wine and other fruit juice not specially enumerated, 60 cents per gallon if containing not more than 18 per cent. of alcohol, and $2.50 per gallon if containing a larger percentage. Cider pays 5 cents per gallon.[2]

EXPORTS.

The liquor export trade is of smaller dimensions than the import business. The following table shows the quantities and values of domestic liquors exported during the year ending June 30, 1889:

---

[1] Liquors imported by foreign ministers to the United States for their own use are, however, admitted duty free, as are liquors "for the use of the United States."

[2] All the rates of customs duty given above are those charged under the new tariff in force Oct. 6, 1890. Under the former tariff ale, beer and porter paid 35 cents per gallon when in bottles, and 20 cents when in casks; distilled liquors, $2 per gallon; sparkling wines at the rate of $7, and still wines $1 60 per dozen quart bottles; barley, 10 cents per bushel; barley malt, 20 cents per bushel; casks, 25 per cent.; glucose, 20 per cent.; hops, 8 cents per lb.; prune wine, etc., 20 per cent.; cider, 20 per cent.

	Quantities.	Values.
Malt Liquors:		
In bottles, doz.	375,059	$575,089
Not in bottles, galls.	170,059	50,307
Total		625,396
Spirits:		
Alcohol, proof galls.	276,726	$78,615
Pure, neutral or cologne, proof galls.	141	115
Rum, "	445,589	524,509
Bourbon Whiskey, proof galls.	1,292,329	1,081,347
Rye Whiskey, proof galls.	383,805	362,688
All other, "	294,840	170,827
Totals	2,693,430	$2,218,101
Wines:		
In bottles, doz.	7,311	$33,000
Not in bottles, galls.	372,350	236,488
Total		$269,488
Grand total		3,112,985

Besides domestic liquors, there were exported in 1889 foreign liquors of these values: Malt liquors, $3,995; spirits, $49,755; wines, $68,020.

In the following table, the quantities and values of domestic liquors exported are given for a series of years:

	Malt Liquors.		Spirits.		Wines.		All Liquors.
	Quantities.	Values.	Proof Gallons.	Values.	Quantities.	Values.	Values.
1880	146,739 doz.	$298,818	11,418,506	$3,027,545	154,887 galls.	$123,317	$3,449,680
	111,308 galls.						
1885	233,816 doz.	436,321	11,077,943	5,565,216	6,487 doz.	32,725	6,151,933
	170,118 galls.	55,097			79,733 galls.	62,574	
1886	352,898 doz.	590,608	5,355,419	2,745,514	6,051 doz.	24,813	3,520,567
	233,941 galls.	76,755			119,085 galls.	93,297	
1887	372,432 doz.	590,378	2,517,356	801,103	4,426 doz.	23,499	1,672,987
	203,972 galls.	66,335			282,007 galls.	191,672	
1888	395,424 doz.	644,125	1,885,866	871,377	7,185 doz.	31,698	1,791,442
	146,226 galls.	42,717			202,233 galls.	201,525	
1889	375,059 doz.	575,089	2,693,430	2,218,101	7,311 doz.	33,000	3,112,985
	170,059 galls.	50,307			372,350 galls.	236,488	

All the malt and vinous liquors exported are shipped to foreign countries for sale. These exports are increasing materially. The largest part of the American beer and wine product goes to the countries of the North and South American continents, Central America and the neighboring islands. Of the exports of beer in 1889, valued at $625,496, all but about $30,000 worth was taken by these countries and islands. There is a considerable demand for our beer in the black Republics of Hayti and San Domingo, and for our wine in the Hawaiian Islands.

The exports of distilled spirits are not *bona fide* exports, considered as a whole. They include large quantities of whiskey shipped temporarily to foreign ports, with the purpose of leaving them there for a time, and then bringing them back, the object being to postpone payment of the United States Internal Revenue taxes. The seemingly large decline in the exports of spirits since 1880 is due partly to a decrease in the quantity of whiskey so shipped and partly to an almost complete disappearance of the European demand for American alcohol and raw spirits, this disappearance being occasioned by the cheapness of the German product. The ports to which most of the American whiskey is sent for temporary storage are Hamburg, Bremen, Liverpool, West Indian ports and Honolulu. In 1889 the total exports of bourbon and rye whiskey amounted to 1,676,134 proof gallons, of which 1,366,393 proof gallons were sent to Germany, 174,841 to the British West Indies, 40,955 to England, 32,960 to the Danish West Indies and 18,416 to the Hawaiian Islands—making a total of 1,633,565 proof gallons, or 97 per cent. of the entire exports of bourbon and rye whiskey, and more than 60 per cent. of the exports of spirits of all kinds.

Of the *bona fide* exports of American spirits, a very large percentage goes to heathen lands to be used in trade with the savages. The item "Rum," in the statistical tables of exports, stands almost exclusively for spirits of the most fiery and vilest nature. Below are given the quantities and values of rum shipped from the United States in 1889 to all countries:[1]

---

[1] Even the export trade in this wretched rum shows a marked decline on account of German competition. The following figures show the total exports of rum to British Africa for the years named: 1885, 794,311 gallons; 1886, 737,650 gallons; 1887, 632,986 gallons; 1888, 690,237 gallons; 1889, 202,619 gallons.

DESTINATION.	PROOF GALLS.	VALUES.
French Possessions in Africa and adjacent islands	94,389	$113,261
Germany	401	371
England	135,749	157,999
Scotland	5,150	1,545
British West Indies	1,609	820
British Possessions in Africa and adjacent islands	202,619	244,405
Hayti	50	50
Spanish Possessions in Africa and adjacent islands	5,580	6,000
All other islands and ports	42	58
Totals	445,589	$524,509

Of these 445,589 gallons of rum, 302,588 gallons went to African ports. This entire export trade in rum had for its sole object the corruption of aborigines, for not a gallon of the quantity sent to Africa has been returned.

J. C. FERNALD.

Independent Order of Good Templars.—This is the most widespread international organization based on total abstinence and Prohibition principles. It was founded in central New York in the summer of 1851, and soon spread into other States and Canada. In May, 1855, representatives of the Grand Lodges of New York, Pennsylvania, Canada, Iowa, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, Illinois and Ohio, in session at Cleveland, O., organized the Right Worthy Grand Lodge as the supreme governing body of the Order. There are now branches throughout the civilized world—in every State and Territory of the United States, in every Province of Canada, in England, Wales, Ireland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and other countries of Europe, in India, China, Japan, Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Tasmania, the Sandwich Islands and in numerous islands of the ocean.

The Right Worthy Grand Lodge has jurisdiction over the whole Order. But during the period from 1876 to 1887 the Order was divided. At the annual convention at Louisville in 1876, there were differences of opinion on the negro question, the representatives from Great Britain and Ireland and those from the United States taking opposing views. Two distinct Right Worthy Grand Lodges were accordingly set up, and the separation continued until each branch exercised authority over about 300,000 members. John B. Finch, as the head of the American branch, set for himself the task of reuniting the Order, and at Saratoga, in 1887, his labors were crowned with success. Since then perfect harmony has prevailed, and the influence and prosperity of the Order have steadily increased.

There are at present about 90 Grand Lodges and 12,000 subordinate Lodges, having a membership (male and female, including juveniles) of more than 600,000. Not less than 400,000 drinking men have taken the pledge under the auspices of the Good Templars. The obligation subscribed to by each member is for life, and is as follows:

> "No member shall make, buy, sell, use, furnish, or cause to be furnished to others, as a beverage, any spirituous or malt liquors, wine or cider; and every member shall discountenance the manufacture, sale and use thereof, in all proper ways."

The following is the "platform of principles," adopted in 1859:

> "1. Total abstinence from all intoxicating liquor as a beverage.
>
> "2. No license in any form, or under any circumstances, for the sale of such liquors as a beverage.
>
> "3. The absolute Prohibition of the manufacture, importation and the sale of intoxicating liquors for such purposes,—prohibited by the will of the people, expressed in due form of law, with the penalties deserved for a crime of such enormity.
>
> "4. The creation of a healthy public opinion upon the subject by the active dissemination of truth in all the modes known to an enlightened philanthropy.
>
> "5. The election of good, honest men to administer the laws.
>
> "6. Persistence in efforts to save individuals and communities from so direful a scourge, against all forms of opposition and difficulty, until our success is complete and universal."

The present chief officers (1890) are: Right Worthy Grand Templar, William W. Turnbull, Glasgow, Scotland; Right Worthy Grand Counselor, Dr. Oronhyatekha, Toronto, Can.; Right Worthy Grand Vice-Templar, Mrs. F. E. Finch, Evanston, Ill.; Right Worthy Grand Superintendent of Juvenile Temples, Mrs. A. A. Brookbank, Jeffersonville, Ind.; Right Worthy Grand Secretary, B. F. Parker, Milwaukee, Wis.; Right Worthy Grand Treasurer, W. Martin Jones, Rochester, N. Y.

The following are the names of those who have held the position of Right Worthy Grand Templar since the beginning of the Order: James M. Moore of Kentucky, 1855–6; S. M. Smith of

Pennsylvania, 1856–7; O. W. Strong of Illinois, 1857–8; Simeon B. Chase of Pennsylvania, 1858–63; Samuel D. Hastings of Wisconsin, 1863–8, 1873–4; Jonathan H. Orne of Massachusetts, 1868–71; John Russell of Michigan, 1871–3; John J. Hickman of Kentucky, 1874–7, 1879–81; Theodore D. Kanouse of Wisconsin, 1877–9; George B. Katzenstein of California, 1881–4; John B. Finch of Illinois, 1884–7; W. W. Turnbull of Glasgow, Scotland, 1887.

B. F. Parker,
R. W. G. Secretary, I. O. G. T.

India.[1]—The history—or modern history—of the drink curse in India dates from the introduction of the British Excise system near the close of the 18th Century. Previously to the era of British dominion, the inhabitants of India were among the most abstemious of peoples. Though the ancient use of intoxicants in connection with religious worship and as a social custom is mentioned in the Vedas, Puranas, Tantras and other sacred books, and though intemperance is attributed even to some of the gods of the Hindus, the moralists and lawgivers sternly and steadfastly condemned indulgence in alcoholic liquors. In the Buddhist scriptures and also in the Mohammedan Koran strong drink is prohibited. The earliest Europeans visiting India testified to the freedom of the people from the vice of intemperance. The fermenting process was undoubtedly known in very distant ages, fermented liquors being made from the juices of the soma and sura; but it was reserved for the Christain English to sanction and foster a traffic and a vice that had been discountenanced and repressed by Hindu and Mohammedan rulers alike.

THE BRITISH EXCISE POLICY.

The British Government in India inaugurated its Excise policy in 1790, but for 30 or 40 years comparatively little liquor was sold. Until Sept. 19, 1878, all the distilleries were owned and operated by the Government, under what was known as the Sudder (or District) Still system. The sole object was to produce revenues, and it was thought the distilling business would be most profitable if operated by the Government itself. Under this system the revenue finally reached considerable proportions—in excess of $10,000,000 annually; but the authorities were not satisfied, and a new scheme was devised.

On Sept. 19, 1878, the new measure, or Abkari act as it was called, was published by the Government of Bombay. At first it applied only to the Bombay Presidency, but it is now in force over all India, excepting a few small districts under native rule. Its distinctive feature is the "Out Still" system. The right to operate distilleries in competition with the Government is sold at public auctions to the highest bidders. The successful bidder in each locality may distill as much liquor as he chooses, and of any kind and quality, free from Government supervision. But the revenue from private distillers, though the chief element of the Excises, is only one element. All the sap-bearing palm trees of India—trees yielding juice from which fermented liquor is made and spirits are distilled,—are taxed by the Government; the right to draw the sap is farmed out to the highest bidder, and nobody—not even the owner of the trees—can extract sap without a Government license. Licenses to sell liquor at retail are also sold to the highest bidder. Thus the Excise policy of India is based on the High License principle exclusively. And like the High License legislation of the United States it is an entire success as a revenue measure.

In the year 1873–4 (before the Abkari act went into effect), the drink revenue in the whole of India was £2,300,000; in 1878–9 it was £2,600,000; in 1883, £3,609,000; in 1884, £3,836,000; in 1885, £4,012,000; in 1886, £4,152,000, and in 1887, £4,266,000.[2] Details of the increase in revenue in particular parts of India are even more appalling. Statistics given by W. S. Caine and Samuel Smith in the British House of Commons, March 13, 1888, show that in eight years the increase was 135 per cent. in Bengal; in the Central Provinces it was 100 per cent. in 10 years, etc. In Ceylon the revenue from drink is almost 14 per cent. of the total revenue. "The Government are driving this liquor trade as hard as they can," said Mr. Caine. "Collectors find it the easiest way to increase their contribution to the revenue, and for years they have been stimulating the consumption of liquor to the utmost. If the Government continue their present policy of doubling the revenue every 10 years, in 30 years India will be one of the most drunken and degraded countries on the face of the earth." In the same debate Sir G. Campbell said the Excise revenue was "the only progressive revenue of India, and had been going up by leaps and bounds."

---

[1] The editor is indebted to Wallace J. Gladwin, Miles, Ia.; Mrs. Emma Brainerd Ryder, Bombay, India, and Mrs. Mary Clement Leavitt.

[2] Intemperance in India, by Bishop J. F. Hurst, *Century Magazine* for July, 1889.

The Government of India, however, merits commendation for making none of the virtuous pretensions that are advanced by the High License politicians of the United States. The officials frankly declare that they are interested in the revenue solely, and not in the promotion of temperance. In 1888 the Finance Minister for India used the following language in the Legislative Council: "I look hopefully to a considerable increase in the Excise revenues, and believe that a great deal might be done in Northern India by the introduction of the methods which in Bombay and Madras have so powerfully contributed to the increase of revenue under this head."

In Bengal the Government applauded 16 collectors who had largely increased the liquor sales in their districts. In the vicinity of Bombay a movement was started among the country people against the use and sale of liquor, whereupon the magistrate had eight of the leaders imprisoned. In reporting this tyrannical act to the Secretary of State in London, the Government of Bombay said: "The question for decision is, shall we sit quiet and allow the temperance movement in the Colaba District to continue and to spread, and thereby forfeit a large amount of revenue, or are measures to be adopted which will bring the people to their senses?" Such facts as these moved Mr. Caine to say in Parliament, April 30, 1889: "All moral considerations are swamped in the effort to obtain revenue," and "the worst and rottenest Excise system in the civilized world is that of India."

SHOCKING RESULTS.

This conclusion was voiced by Parliament itself, in more cautious but highly significant language. The following resolution, though warmly opposed by Salisbury's Tory Ministry, was passed by the House of Commons on the same day (April 30, 1889):

> "That, in the opinion of this House, the fiscal system of the Government of India leads to the establishment of spirit distilleries, liquor and opium shops in large numbers of places where till recently they never existed, in defiance of native opinion and the protests of the inhabitants, and that such increased facilities for drinking produce a steadily increasing consumption, and spread misery and ruin among the industrial classes of India, calling for immediate action on the part of the Government of India with a view to their abatement."

With so striking an expression of opinion delivered by a legislative body under the control of a powerful Conservative majority, it goes without saying that the results of the High License policy from a temperance point of view have been shocking in the extreme. All authorities are agreed in testifying that intemperance has made great strides in India under the Abkari act. Sap-gatherers, distillers and retail liquor-dealers alike have every incentive to corrupt the populace and sell as much liquor as possible: each licensee pays the maximum price for the privilege of doing business, with the express understanding that his license is subject to revocation if, at its expiration, some more anxious competitor outbids him; therefore he has the strongest reasons for stimulating the consumption of liquor to the utmost limit.

The holy city of Benares (with its outlying district), according to the *Abkari*, monthly organ of the Anglo-Indian Temperance Association, consumed 158,356 gallons of spirits in 1887. The population of Benares city and districts was 892,684; yet the district of Gorukpore, with a population of 2,617,120, consumed only 57,571 gallons in the same year. These figures illustrate how the people of India, even in the regions where native customs and religion are apparently strongest, are being corrupted by the English drink traffic.

Under vigorous pressure from the public, the Government appointed a commission to inquire into the effects of the Excise system. Although many of the officials attempted to minify the evil consequences, the reports were filled with painful details. "The habit of drinking has extended to all classes," said the Commissioners of Patna. "Enormous increase of drunkenness," stated an inspector. "The quantity of liquor drunk on holidays is immense," replied another, and similar testimony might be adduced almost without limit.

The missionaries freely make such statements as the following: Archbishop Jeffries, 31 years in India: "For one really converted Christain as the proof of missionary labor, the drinking practices of England have made a thousand drunkards;" Rev. Dr. Phillips: "Our schools for the poor are frequently broken up by the rising flood of intemperance. Our bazaar congregations are often disturbed by drunken fellows, and the work of preaching the gospel is much hindered. Our teachers, pupils, preachers and others are by no means proof to the dire temptations of strong drink;" Dr. Reichel: "A cry of horror rises from all mission fields at the ruin wrought by intoxicating liquor."

The Government-licensed rum is of exceedingly vile quality. Nearly all the liquor manufactured is called "country spirits," "a drink so cheap and poisonous," says the *Banner of Asia*, "that over every licensed house for the sale of it a Government notice is placed, 'No European soldier allowed here.'"[1] In the fiscal year 1887-8, the total Excise revenue of Bengal was 6,456,144 rupees, of which 5,205,122 rupees, or more than 80 per cent., came from the tax on this terrible "country spirits." (A rupee is worth about 50 cents.)

REFORM EFFORTS.

Despite all discouragements there are many earnest temperance laborers in India, and their efforts are bearing fruit. Missionaries, merchants, native gentlemen, manufacturers and a few Government officials have contributed to the cause. A recognized leader is Rev. J. G. Gregson, whose services in promoting total abstinence in the British army in India for 25 years were aided and commended by the highest officers. No person has had larger opportunities to study the question; and he declares that British licensed liquor "will be a curse to the Empire more destructive in its consequences than the heathen customs of their [the natives'] forefathers," and that the Excise regulations and drinking habits are "crimes of equal magnitude with those caused by sutteeism [burning alive of widows], infanticide and fanaticism." An aggressive and well-edited temperance and Prohibition monthly, called the *Banner of Asia*, is published at Tardeo, Bombay. The "United Committee for the Prevention of the Demoralization of Native Races by the Liquor Traffic," is an influential English organization that devotes much attention to India, headquarters being at 127 Palace Chambers, London (Rev. J. Grant Mills, Secretary). The Anglo-Indian Temperance Association works exclusively for temperance reform in India; the President is Samuel Smith, M. P., and the Secretary W. S. Caine, M. P., and the offices are at No. 2 Storey's Gate, S. W., London.

Dr. Emma Brainerd Ryder of Bombay, representing the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union, is now (1890) circulating petitions to the British Government asking that the Excise system be abolished and that all persons be prohibited from taking sap from the palm trees. Pundita Pamabai, the distinguished Hindu woman, has engaged actively in the temperance work since her return from America.

OPIUM AND HASHEESH.

It was India that produced the opium which England forced upon China at the cannon's mouth. (See CHINA.) But the British authorities have not until recently encouraged the consumption of opium among their own subjects. Now opium for native use is grown, manufactured and retailed under Government sanction; and the same is true of the equally noxious preparations familiarly known by the general name of hasheesh, made from the Indian hemp. The consumption of these drugs is increasing at a frightful rate, and the revenue from them is already large. During the fiscal year 1887–8, the revenue of the Bengal Government from opium was 2,107,638 rupees, and from preparations of the Indian hemp, 2,292,012 rupees.

---

[1] The liquor sold is a fiery, stifling, poisonous spirit, and a heavy penalty is awarded to any keeper found selling it to an English soldier. To the debauched intellects of the persons in the Indian Government responsible for these iniquities, the life of the English soldier is valuable because of his costliness to the State, whilst that of the native coolie is valueless, and there are no scruples to obtaining revenue from his death through these licensed poisons.—*Banner of Asia*, September, 1889.

"All opium in India," says a highly intelligent Indian writer, "is derived from two sources, that grown in the Native States, and that grown by the license of the Indian Government, manufactured in the Government factories and sold by Government officials. With regard to the opium grown in the Native States, all, or nearly all, of this is produced for the China market, and the Indian Government levies a very heavy transit duty. The Native States are under British control and completely surrounded by British territory. At every railway station on the borders of these States, an Indian Government official is kept with a pair of scales, and all opium coming from these States on the way to Bombay, etc., for shipment to China is weighed and the duty paid to him before it is allowed to proceed farther. Any one even possessing this native opium in India without having paid the duty is liable to 1,000 rupees fine and one year's imprisonment, under Section 9 of the Opium act of 1878.

"With regard to the opium produced directly by the Indian Government, the plan pursued is that the Indian Goverment licenses certain men to grow the poppy. It then advances money to these men in order to enable them to do this, and to keep them entirely in its power. When the poppy is ripe the cultivator makes slits in the head of the plant from which a white juice exudes. This turns to a black hard substance by exposure to the air and is scraped off the plant, and carefully collected, and sold to the Indian Government at a fixed rate (about 3 rupees a pound). If the cultivator sells a drop of the juice to any one else but the Government, he is liable to 1,000 rupees fine and one year's imprisonment, under Section 9 of Act No. 1 of 1878 (the Opium act). The Indian Government having bought the hardened juice, transports it to great factories at Patna and elsewhere, managed by Government officials and guarded by Government soldiers, where it is made ready for use. Large quantities are sent to China, into which country it was at first smuggled by great East Indiamen (vessels bristling with cannon like men-of-war), but is now imported under treaties wrung from the Chinese by several bloody wars. But these Government factories are also now sending out large and increasing quantities for use in India. In that case it is sent to the 'Collectors' of the various districts, who are also magistrates. These Collectors are the wholesale dealers in the drug, and sell it to the contractors. The contractors are forced under a heavy fine to sell a certain quantity in their district. If the contractor does not sell as much as he promised to do when he took the contract, he forfeits a heavy sum, and if another man comes and says, 'I will sell more than this contractor,' the contract is given to him. Thus the trade is encouraged and pushed by the Government, and the damnation of the people speeds apace. . . .

"On the 2d of July last (1889), I went to the Null Bazar, Bombay, a great native market, where food, grain, vegetables and meat are sold. I saw a stall licensed by Government, with three divisions, a man seated in each, all three men weighing out the opium in its raw state as fast as they could, to a continuous stream of customers—men, women and children. . . . There are eleven such shops in Bombay. . . . We were informed that the opium contractor in Bombay is bound down to forfeit 3,000 rupees if he fails to sell the quantity contracted for. . . .

"In licensing *ganja*, *bhang*, *charas* and *majum*, the four noxious preparations of the Indian hemp, the Christian Government of India places itself on a much lower moral plane than the Mahommedan Turkish and Egyptian Governments, which most stringently prohibit them. The use of these drugs centers in the worship of Mahadeva or Shiva, the vilest and most licentious idol of the Hindu Pantheon. In precisely the same way as the Christian asks the blessing of his Heavenly Father on his wholesome food, so does the licentious slave of the products of the Indian hemp invoke his filthy god, before partaking of the above four poisons, licensed by the Indian Government. As with opium, so with the preparations of the Indian hemp, there are houses specially licensed by the Government for the sale of the drug. There is a stall in the largest food-market of Bombay, the Crawford Market, at which there is sold *bhang*, *charas* and *ganja*, the three principal products of the Indian hemp, and nothing else."[1]

Indiana.—See Index.

Indians (North American).—The Government of the United States prohibits absolutely the sale to Indians on reservations of any intoxicating beverages. No trader is allowed to traffic in them, and any person who surreptitiously sells or gives liquor of any description to Indians, whether it is done on or off a reservation, is liable to a fine of $300 and two years' imprisonment. The Indian Bureau uses all diligence to enforce these laws, but in spite of every effort the evils of intemperance among the Indians are very great. Nothing, perhaps, stands more in the way of their progress in civilization, or is more hurtful to them in all respects, than the use of strong drink. The records of the Indian Office abound in facts to illustrate this general statement.

Not all Indians, by any means, are addicted to the habit of drinking. Many of them are total abstainers, some from principle, others from necessity; but the evils of drinking are greatly intensified among them by the vile character of much of the stuff that is furnished to them. They are still further aggravated by the improvident character of this people, and their readiness while under the influence of intoxicants to fling reason and self-control to the winds, and give loose rein to all their vile passions. It is a distressing fact that while great efforts are being put forth to induce the Indians to lay aside their savage customs, become civilized and adopt the "white man's ways," so many white men are ready to supply them with that which sinks them even lower in the scale of being than savagery. It is sadder still that army officers, Indian agents, physicians and even teachers, sometimes set the Indians examples of drunkenness.

---

[1] *Banner of Asia*, September, 1889.

There are many practical difficulties in the way of the effectual enforcement of the Government Prohibitory laws on Indian reservations. The 250,000 Indians are scattered over a great territory of nearly 190,000 square miles, making it well-nigh impossible to police such a region with any force. The police force at the disposal of the Indian Office is inadequate and inefficient. The opportunities for evasion are many, and the facilities for detection are few. It should be said, however, that a large number of the agents and other employees of the Indian service are not only men of sobriety, but are zealous in co-operating with the central office in preventing just as far as possible the liquor traffic.

As the Indians are fast becoming citizens, the importance of the proper instruction of the rising generation in temperance principles is urgent and cannot be over-estimated. Every Indian school should have a temperance organization and should be equipped with an abundance of appropriate temperance literature. Every teacher and every other employee on a reservation should be an out-and-out temperance man or woman, whose daily life will be an object lesson of the principles inculcated. Thus, and thus only, can the Government laws be of any avail, or the fearful evils of intemperance among these people be lessened.

T. J. MORGAN.

(United States Commissioner of Indian Affairs.)

Historical Note.[1]—Unlike the natives of Mexico and South America, the North American Indians never made alcoholic liquor of any kind. "It is very certain," says Heckewelder, "that the processes of distillation and fermentation are entirely unknown to the Indians, and that they have among them no intoxicating liquors but such as they receive from us. The Mexicans have their pulque and other indigenous beverages of an inebriating nature, but the North American Indians, before their intercourse with us commenced, had absolutely nothing of the kind."[2] Distilled spirits were given to the Indians by nearly all the European pioneers. The unknown drink was at first taken with hesitation and fear, and then was eagerly craved and constantly demanded. One of the best-supported of Indian traditions, says Heckewelder, relates that the name of Manhattan Island (New York) is corrupted from *Manahachtanienk*, meaning in the Delaware language, "The island where we all became intoxicated."[3] The fondness of the Indians for spirits encouraged unscrupulous traders to use rum as the chief medium of exchange in their dealings with savages having furs and other valuable articles to dispose of.

In some instances the shocking results appealed to philanthropic feelings and caused persons in authority to prohibit the giving of liquor to Indians. The refusal of William Penn and the Friends to take advantage of the appetites of the natives is one of the most memorable of these instances. As early as 1685, the Yearly Meeting of Friends for Pennsylvania and New Jersey adopted the following minute :

> "This meeting doth unanimously agree and give as their judgment that it is not consistent with the honor of truth for any that make profession thereof, to sell rum or any strong liquors to the Indians, because they use them not to moderation but to excess and drunkenness."

In New England also it was made unlawful to provide the Indians with strong drink. The Massachusetts Colony in London in 1629, in a letter of instructions to Governor Endicott, said :

> "We pray you endeavor, though there be much strong water for sale, yet so to order it as that the savages may not, for our lucre sake,

---

[1] The information here given is derived chiefly from "Alcohol in History," by Richard Eddy, D. D. (New York, 1887), pp. 75, 177–86.

[2] History, Manners and Customs of the Indian Nations, etc., by Rev. John Heckewelder, chap. 36.

[3] Ibid., pp. 71–4, 262.

be induced to the excessive use, or rather abuse of it; and at any time take care our people give no ill example; and if any shall exceed in the inordinate kind of drinking as to become drunk, we hope you will take care his punishment be made exemplary for all others."

One of the earliest laws of the colony, passed in 1633, directed that "No man shall sell or (being in the course of trade) give any strong water to any Indians."[1] But in 1644 this prohibition was modified, the following curious order being promulgated:

> "The Court, apprehending that it is not fit to deprive the Indians of any lawful comforts which God alloweth to all men by the use of wine, orders that it shall be lawful for all who are licensed to retail wines to sell also to Indians."[2]

This discrimination in favor of wines did not work, and in 1648 it was ordered that "only one person in Boston be allowed to sell wine to the Indians."[3] In 1657 a return was made to the original law, it being decreed that "All persons are wholly prohibited to sell, truck, barter or give any strong liquors to any Indian, directly or indirectly, whether known by the name of rum, strong waters, wine, strong beer, brandy, cider or perry, or any other strong liquors going under any other name whatsoever."[4]

The Prohibitory regulations of Oglethorpe in Georgia (1733) against the importation and sale of distilled spirits were of great benefit to the Indians and promoted friendly relations between them and the whites. But the neighboring colony of South Carolina sanctioned the rum traffic, and "the enforcement of the law among the Indians in Georgia," says Prof. Scomp, "was scarcely thought of."[5] "Of all other causes," said a contemporary writer, "the introduction of spirituous liquors among them [the Indians], for which they discovered an amazing appetite, has proved the most destructive."[6]

In every stage of the sad history of the Indians, whiskey has been probably the chief agent in the work of corruption and extermination. There is no other truth better established than this in the annals of the North American continent.

Indian Territory.—See Index.

Inebriate Asylums.—The theory that inebriety is a disease has been supported for centuries by physicians, philosophers and statesmen, but the world has not been ready to accept it until very recently. Near the beginning of the present century Dr. Rush of Philadelphia advocated the building of special asylums for inebriates; and Dr. Woodward of Worcester afterwards seconded this suggestion. The Connecticut State Medical Society in 1830 petitioned the Legislature to erect an inebriate asylum, and the English Lunacy Commission in 1844 recommended that inebriates be declared insane and that separate institutions be constructed for them. Eminent men in Europe and America approved this proposition, but nothing was done until 1846, when Dr. J. E. Turner of Bath, Me., made efforts in New York to bring about the formation of a company to build an asylum for inebriates. Six years later application was made to the New York Legislature for a charter for such an asylum. Strong and bitter opposition was encountered, and it was not until 1854 that the charter was granted. Ten years later an inebriate asylum was opened in the city of Binghamton, N. Y.—the first in history. It was erected with money raised by private subscription. There was much controversy concerning it, and finally it fell into the hands of politicians and was converted into an insane asylum in 1880. During the 16 years of its existence over 4,000 inebriates were treated, and from studies made in 2,000 cases it was ascertained that 61 per cent. of the patients had been restored to health and sobriety.

Other institutions were founded in the United States and various foreign countries. Interest in the study of inebriety has steadily increased and the literature of the subject has received numerous contributions of great value. The United States, which took the lead, has shown greater activity in the founding of inebriate asylums than any other country.

Of asylums for the treatment of the intemperate, there are three distinct classes: (1) Asylums or hospitals established by

---

[1] Massachusetts Colony Records, vol. 1, p. 16.
[2] Ibid, vol. 2, p. 85.
[3] Ibid, vol. 2, p. 258.
[4] Ibid, vol. 3, p. 425.
[5] King Alcohol in the Realm of King Cotton, by H. A. Scomp, Ph. D., p. 118.
[6] A Historical Account of South Carolina and Georgia (London, 1779), vol. 2, p. 279.

State aid, corporations or private enterprise (with the prestige of legislation), where the inebriate is regarded as diseased and treated on broad scientific principles. The Inebriates' Home at Fort Hamilton, N. Y., the Washingtonian Home at Boston, the Inebriates' Home at San Francisco and Walnut Lodge at Hartford are among the principal asylums of this class. (2) Hospitals and retreats where inebriates are admitted with persons suffering from other forms of mental disease, and all are treated in common. In many of these institutions the inebriate is looked upon as half diseased and half vicious, requiring a mixed treatment. In some of them the proportion of inebriates is very large, and inebriety is treated under the name of "nerve exhaustion" or "debility." Nearly all the private retreats for victims of mental disorders are of this class. (3) Asylums in which all questions of disease are ignored, excepting in cases that result from the direct use of spirits and that are quickly relieved. They rely distinctively upon moral and religious agencies, pledges, prayers, etc. The Franklin Home of Philadelphia and the Christian Home of New York are well-known types.

The inebriate asylums in Europe are small, and nearly all of them are private institutions or under the control of churches or temperance societies. The Dalrymple Home, near London, is one of the largest and best equipped.

All these institutions, both in America and abroad, are yet in their infancy; not one of them is able to do the work that should be accomplished, because opposition and criticism are still to be overcome. Some impressive truths have been established. It is certain that the treatment given in inebriate asylums enables an encouragingly large number of victims to permanently recover, and gives all a better chance for recovery than could be obtained at home. The proportion of cases actually cured varies from 20 to 50 per cent. Those who have made careful studies from large experience seem to agree that among inebriates under treatment for from four to six months, at least 33 per cent. are cured. Dr. Norman Kerr of London, President of the Dalrymple Home, and Dr. Day and Dr. Mason of this country, regard this estimate as approximately correct. The future looks promising, and it is believed that the public will support inebriate asylums with increasing generosity. The medical profession certainly manifest a growing interest in the study of inebriety. Four important medical societies are discussing the subject from the scientific side alone, and two journals are exclusively devoted to the scientific aspects of inebriety. To all who have witnessed the good work wrought, it seems unexplainable that there should be any opposition to so reasonable an idea as that for quarantining the inebriate, removing him from all exciting influences, and applying to his case the remedies most likely to effect a cure.

T. D. CROTHERS.

Injunction Law.—The most valuable instrument for expeditiously and effectively enforcing Prohibitory measures. Where the statutes provide that the premises of liquor-manufacturers or sellers may be closed by the "injunction" process, it is not necessary to grant the offender a trial by jury; but upon satisfactory evidence that liquor is sold or kept in violation of law, his place may be adjudged a nuisance by proceedings in equity, it may be summarily closed and the contraband goods may be seized.

The unsatisfactoriness of trial by jury in liquor cases, even where the testimony is overwhelming, has always been notorious. A single juror may prevent conviction ; and with the strong prejudices prevailing among a numerous class of citizens against Prohibitory laws and the readiness of multitudes, especially in the cities, to recognize no moral obligation to assist in punishing violators of such laws, it is not strange that jury trials of saloon malefactors are likely to prove farcical. The ordinary proceedings for practically crushing out the liquor-sellers are necessarily brought in the petty Courts, where the machinery of justice is too often under the control of politicians. Partisan influences, selfish interests and personal sympathy with the liquor element combine to secure the open or secret connivance of prosecuting officers; and where the demand for enforcement is regarded with official hostility or indifference, the system of trial by jury can be made a mere cloak for unscrupulous manipulation or half-hearted efforts. On the other hand, where officials are well-meaning, incorruptible and even distinctly friendly to enforcement, the repeated refusals of juries to accept indisputable evidence are naturally discouraging to honest prosecutors and cause partial or entire suspension of energetic work. There have been some notable exceptions: in the rural communities juries are generally obedient to aggressive public sentiment, and in some large cities liquor cases have been suitably disposed of by jury trials; but as a rule juries have been derelict in proportion to the magnitude of the evil and the clearness of evidence against law violators.

The denial to defiant liquor-sellers, in certain States, of the right of trial by jury, is a logical outcome of the theory of Prohibitory legislation. Where the people enact such legislation the liquor business becomes a criminal occupation, and in the judgment of a majority of the people every establishment used for carrying on the unlawful traffic is a common nuisance. Official cognizance of the existence of such an establishment justifies, therefore, immediate and arbitrary action by the executive and judicial departments of government; and any valid form of law that will facilitate suppression of the objectionable traffic may properly be invoked.

The power to enjoin a liquor establishment conducted and known as a nuisance, has always been among the ordinary equity powers of Courts of Chancery; and before any real extension of this power was made by the Legislatures, and in very old statutes, unlicensed liquor places were declared nuisances, and this of itself made them subject to abatement under the equity power of injunction. The recent Prohibitory statutes, like those of Iowa and Kansas, enacted the details of procedure to procure abatement by injunction, and thus have made this remedy practicable.

The amendatory Prohibition statute passed in Kansas in 1885 contained provisions for nuisances and injunction proceedings more radical than those embraced in any former Prohibitory law. This Kansas Injunction act has been reviewed by the United States Supreme Court and pronounced not only sound but "salutary;" and it has been accepted as the pattern for all acts of like nature. The thirteenth section of it is as follows:

> "All places where intoxicating liquors are manufactured, sold, bartered or given away in violation of any of the provisions of this act, or where intoxicating liquors are kept for sale, barter or delivery in violation of this act, are hereby declared to be common nuisances, and upon the judgment of any Court having jurisdiction finding such place to be a nuisance under this section, the Sheriff, his Deputy or Under-Sheriff, or any Constable of the proper county, or Marshal of any city where the same is located, shall be directed to shut up and abate such place by taking possession thereof and destroying all intoxicating liquors found therein, together with all signs, screens, bars, bottles, glasses and other property used in keeping and maintaining said nuisance; and the owner or keeper thereof shall, upon conviction, be adjudged guilty of maintaining a common nuisance, and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $100, nor more than $500, and by imprisonment in the county jail not less than 30 days nor more than 90 days. The Attorney-General, County Attorney, or any citizen of the county where such nuisance exists or is kept or is maintained, may maintain an action in the name of the State to abate and perpetually enjoin the same. The injunction shall be granted at the commencement of the action, and no bond shall be required. Any person violating the terms of any injunction granted in such proceeding shall be punished as for contempt by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $500, or by imprisonment in the county jail not less than 30 days nor more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the Court."

One of the most valuable features of this measure is the provision that "the *Attorney-General*, County Attorney, *or any citizen of the county* where such nuisance exists or is kept or is maintained may maintain an action in the name of the State to abate and perpetually enjoin the same." Therefore in a community where the local prosecuting officer is for any reason neglectful of his duties under the Prohibitory law, the State Attorney-General may interfere and compel obedience; and if both the County Attorney and the Attorney-General fail to act, any citizen may move against offenders "in the name of the State." This gives the friends of the law authority to take the prosecuting machinery into their own hands whenever the officials do not perform their work satisfactorily; but in thus becoming responsible for prosecutions they become responsible also for costs in case the Judge decides that the places complained against are not in fact nuisances. Under the Kansas Injunction law the Judges have arbitrary authority, and if the liquor element is strong enough to control the Judges even this powerful statute may be made temporarily unavailing. But other clauses of the Kansas law prescribe severe penalties, to be visited upon all officials and Judges who are derelict; and although the actual punishment of an unscrupulous Judge cannot be confidently predicted, the provisions of the law are so radical that no Judge who values his reputation for character and conscience can afford to stand in the way of enforcement. Again, in injunction proceedings there is little room for differences of opinion concerning the merits of cases, for dilatory quibbles, perjured testimony or sophistical representations; the statute declares that any place where liquor is unlawfully sold or kept is a nuisance, and no legal argument or discriminating judgment is required to determine whether a certain place falls under the statutory definition; proof of unlawful sale or possession alone is necessary, and proof satisfactory to a responsible Judge and not to jurors of questionable motives or pro-saloon tendencies.

It was claimed by the anti-Prohibition advocates that the Kansas Injunction law was repugnant to the provision made in the 14th Amendment to the Federal Constitution, that no State shall "deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law;" but their efforts to secure judicial sanction for their view were as unsuccessful as in the case of their demand for compensation.[1] When the Kansas Prohibition cases were argued before the United States Supreme Court the counsel for the brewers made a formidable attack upon Section 13 of the Kansas law of 1885. In the famous decision of December, 1887, the Court devoted considerable space to the question of the validity of that section, and seven of the eight Justices then on the bench voted to sustain it (Justice Field dissenting). The Court presented the arguments against and for the Injunction law so thoroughly that we quote all that part of the decision bearing upon this subject (123 U. S, 623):

> "It is contended in the case of Kansas v. Ziebold & Hagelin, that the entire scheme of this section is an attempt to deprive persons who come within its provisions of their property and of their liberty without due process of law, especially when taken in connection with that clause of Section 14 (amendatory of Section 21 of the act of 1881) which provides that 'in prosecutions under this act, by indictment or otherwise, . . . it shall not be necessary in the first instance for the State to prove that the party charged did not have a permit to sell intoxicating liquors for the excepted purposes.'
>
> "We are unable to perceive anything in these regulations inconsistent with the Constitutional guarantees of liberty and property. The State having authority to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for other than medical, scientific and mechanical purposes, we do not doubt her power to declare that any place kept and maintained for the illegal manufacture and sale of such liquors shall be deemed a common nuisance and be abated, and at the same time to provide for the indictment and trial of the offender. One is a proceeding against the property used for forbidden purposes, while the other is for the punishment of the offender.
>
> "It is said that by the 13th Section of the act of 1885, the Legislature, finding a brewery within the State in actual operation, without notice, trial, or hearing, by the mere exercise of its arbitrary caprice, declares it to be a common nuisance and then prescribes the consequences which are to follow inevitably by judicial mandate required by the statute, and involving and permitting the exercise of no judicial discretion or judgment; that the brewery being found in operation the Court is not to determine whether it is a common nuisance, but under the command of the statute is to find it to be one; that it is not the liquor made, or the making of it, which is thus enacted to be a common nuisance, but the place itself, including all the property used in keeping and maintaining the common nuisance; that the Judge, having thus signed without inquiry, and it may be against the fact and against his own judgment, the edict of the Legislature, the Court is commanded by its officers to take possession of the place and shut it up; nor is all this destruction of property, by legislative edict, to be made as a forfeiture consequent upon conviction of any offence, but merely because the Legislature so commands; and it is done by a Court of Equity, without any previous conviction first had, or any trial known to the law.
>
> "This certainly is a formidable arraignment of the legislation of Kansas, and if it were founded upon a just interpretation of her statutes the Court would have no difficulty in declaring that they could not be enforced without infringing the Constitutional rights of the citizen. But these statutes have no such scope and are not attended with any such results as the defendants suppose. The Court is not required to give effect to a legislative 'decree' or 'edict,' unless every enactment by the law-making power of a State is to be so characterized.
>
> "It is not declared that every establishment is to be deemed a common nuisance because it may have been maintained prior to the passage of the statute as a place for manufacturing intoxicating liquors. The statute is prospective in its operation—that is, it does not put the brand of a common nuisance upon any place,

---

[1] See pp. 92-4.

unless after its passage that place is kept and maintained for purposes declared by the Legislature to be injurious to the community. Nor is the Court required to adjudge any place to be a common nuisance simply because it is charged by the State to be such. It must first find it to be of that character—that is, must ascertain in some legal mode whether since the statute was passed the place in question has been or is being so used as would make it a common nuisance.

"Equally tenable is the proposition that proceedings in equity for the purposes indicated in the 13th Section of the statute are inconsistent with due process of law. 'In regard to public nuisances,' Mr. Justice Story says, 'the jurisdiction of Courts of Equity seems to be of a very ancient date, and has been distinctly traced back to the reign of Queen Elizabeth. The jurisdiction is applicable not only to public nuisances strictly so-called, but also to purprestures upon public rights and property. In case of public nuisances properly so called, an indictment lies to abate them and to punish the offenders. But an information also lies in equity to redress the grievance by way of injunction.' (2 Story's Eq., sections 921, 922.)

"'The ground of this jurisdiction in cases of purpresture, as well as of public nuisances, is the ability of Courts of Equity to give a more speedy, effectual and permanent remedy than can be had at law. They can not only prevent nuisances that are threatened and before irreparable mischief ensues, but arrest or abate those in progress, and by perpetual injunction protect the public against them in the future; whereas Courts of law can only reach existing nuisances, leaving future acts to be the subject of new prosecutions or proceedings. This is a salutary jurisdiction, especially where a nuisance affects the health, morals or safety of the community. Though not frequently exercised, the power undoubtedly exists in Courts of Equity thus to protect the public against injury: District Attorney v. Lynn & Boston R. R. Co., 16 Gray, 245; Att'y-Gen'l v. N. J. Railroad, 3 Green's Ch., 139; Att'y-General v. Tudor Ice Co., 104 Mass., 244; State v. Mayor, 5 Porter (Ala.), 279, 294; Hoole v. Att'y-General, 22 Ala., 194; Att'y-General v. Hunter, 1 Dev. Eq. 13; Att'y-Gen'l v. Forbes, 2 Mylne & Craig, 123, 129, 133; Att'y-Gen'l v. Great Northern Railway Co., 1 Dr. & Sm., 161; Eden on Injunctions, 259; Kerr on Injunctions (2d Ed.) 168.

"As to the objection that the statute makes no provision for a jury trial in cases like this one, it is sufficient to say that such a mode of trial is not required in suits in equity brought to enjoin a public nuisance. The statutory direction that an injunction issue at the commencement of the action is not to be construed as dispensing with such preliminary proof as is necessary to authorize an injunction pending the suit. The Court is not to issue an injunction simply because one is asked, or because the charge is made that a common nuisance is maintained in violation of law. The statute leaves the Court at liberty to give effect to the principle that an injunction will not be granted to restrain a nuisance, except upon clear and satisfactory evidence that one exists. Here the fact to be ascertained was, not whether a place, kept and maintained for the purposes forbidden by the statute, was, *per se*, a nuisance—that fact being conclusively determined by the statute itself,—but whether the place in question was so kept and maintained. If the proof upon that point is not full or sufficient, the Court can refuse an injunction, or postpone action until the State first obtains the verdict of a jury in her favor."

[For injunction provisions in the statutes of particular States, see LEGISLATION.]

Internal Revenue, in the fiscal nomenclature of the United States, embraces all the revenues of the Federal Government from taxes of whatever kind, collected under the Bureau of Internal Revenue created by the law of July 1, 1862, and connected with the Treasury Department at Washington. Used in its etymological sense, the term would cover all the inland receipts of the Government, no matter from what source derived; and thus "Internal Revenue" and "customs duties" would constitute the two great divisions of the Government's income, the one being the complement of the other. Technically, however, the expression is limited in its acceptation as stated above, and does not include the receipts from patent fees or from the sale of postage-stamps or of the public lands.

The United States has, as a rule, and from the very beginning, preferred to obtain its revenues from duties laid upon imported goods, and has resorted to excises only when forced by over-mastering circumstances to do so, relinquishing them when the means necessary to defray the expenditures of the Government could be obtained from customs receipts. In the early history of the Union, the antipathy of the people to the laying of excises, or inland taxes, was deep-rooted and violent. Nor did they always wait until such taxes were actually proposed or imposed to express their opposition to them. Thus, it was twice moved in the New York Convention called to consider the question of adopting the Constitution, that the power of laying excises should be prohibited to Congress. The general sentiment of our forefathers on the subject of Excise laws may be inferred from these words of Alexander Hamilton in No. 12 of the *Federalist:* "The genius of our people will ill brook the inquisitive and peremptory spirit of Excise laws. . . . It has been already intimated that excises, in their true signification, are too little in unison with the feelings of the people to admit of great use being made of that mode of taxation." But the opposition to excises, in the first decades of our history, was not due entirely to the inherited abhorrence of the inquisitorial nature of their collection; it was largely determined by the economic condition of the country. Impoverished by the War of the Revolution, there was at its close, and for years after it, little in the country on which internal taxes could have been imposed, for neither trade nor manufactures had as yet been developed to any great extent. It is not a matter of surprise, therefore, that the first measure proposed in the United States for the laying of an excise met with defeat.

A bill providing for the taxation of distilled spirits was introduced in Congress in 1790. The representatives of Pennsylvania were utterly opposed to it, and in opposing it they simply executed the will of the people of that State; for they had been instructed by its Legislature to vote against the passage of an excise, "the horror of all free States." In a petition sent to Congress by the inhabitants of Westmoreland, Pa., it was claimed that to convert grain into spirits was as clearly a natural right as to convert grain into flour. The main cause of the defeat of this first measure was, doubtless, the opposition it met with in the State of Pennsylvania and in Congress through the efforts of the Pennsylvania representatives. It would be a mistake to ascribe the antagonism to the taxation of spirits, at that time, to what is called, in our day, the demand for free whiskey. It proceeded from the producers more than from the consumers of spirits, and from the former mainly because it interfered with the utilization of their grain in the only way profitable, in those days, in Western Pennsylvania. The market for that commodity was so remote and the difficulty of transporting it thither so great, because of its bulk, that the farmers of that region were in the habit of converting it into whiskey, in which shape it could be more easily moved. Hence a still was to be found on almost every farm.

It was not long, however, before an increase of the revenue became imperative, and in 1791 Hamilton advocated both an increase of customs duties and a tax on distilled spirits. It was again objected, by the people of Western Pennsylvania, that the tax on spirits would fall very unequally on the different sections of the country, and most heavily on themselves; for their region was then very sparsely populated and had scarcely any money; its trade was by barter, spirits serving as a medium of exchange. The South likewise opposed the bill, "grog" being considered there one of the necessaries of life. The Eastern and the Middle States, however, favored it, and it became a law, having received 39 votes against 19 in the House. It laid a tax of 11 cents per gallon on spirits distilled from foreign materials (molasses and syrups), and 9 cents on those manufactured from domestic material (grain and flour). According to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, the annual production of distilled spirits in the country, at this time, was about 6,500,000 proof gallons, of which it was estimated 3,500,000 gallons were obtained from foreign materials. The tax was light and the necessities of the Government were great and urgent, yet its imposition met with the greatest resistance, and in 1794 the western counties of Pennsylvania rose in open rebellion against its collection. An army composed of the milita of the neighboring States marched into the disturbed districts, seized the leaders of the insurgents and restored the authority of the Federal Government. It cost the Government $1,500,000 to quell the insurrection, while its total expenses, during the same year, for all ordinary purposes were only $4,362,000.

After Thomas Jefferson became President he recommended the repeal of the whole system of Internal Revenue, and his recommendation was carried into effect by the act of April 6, 1802. From this date until 1813, no inland taxes on articles grown or manufactured in the United States were imposed, the import duties being increased whenever a larger revenue was needed. Although, during this interval, the duties on imported goods were raised, they proved altogether insufficient to meet the expenditures occasioned by the War of 1812. To secure funds for that purpose, recourse was first had to loans and the issue of Treasury notes. But even the increased revenue from these sources was inadequate, and in the early part of 1813 a system of Internal Revenue from direct tax and excise was established. At first considered temporary and intended to cease one year after the war, these taxes, with few exceptions, were afterwards extended and pledged for the payment of the principal of the public debt, and it was provided that they should be continued until other equally productive ones were substituted for them. A license tax to distillers took the place of the tax per gallon.

The embarassment of the Federal Treasury, however, grew so great that in 1814 a special session of Congress had to be called and further loans authorized. The direct yearly tax was doubled and extended to the District of Columbia. It became necessary, too, for the first time in the country's history, to tax domestic manufactures other than spirits, snuff and sugar. Specific taxes were imposed on iron and candles, and *ad valorem* taxes on hats, caps, umbrellas, leather boots, plate, beer, ale, playing-cards, harness, household furniture and gold and silver watches.

In 1816 the direct tax was reduced one-half and in the following year all internal taxes were repealed. From 1818 to 1861 no internal tax of any kind was laid in the United States. In the latter year "an act to provide increased revenue from imports, to pay interest on the public debt, and for other purposes," was framed on the 5th of August; but besides providing a revenue from imports it laid a direct tax, apportioned among the States, of $20,000,000 to be collected annually, and also a tax of 3 per cent. on all incomes in excess of $800. The fact that these direct and income taxes were imposed by an act in whose title the very mention of them was carefully avoided, shows how uncertain Congress felt as to how public opinion and popular feeling would receive the proposition to lay them, after the people had, for well-nigh half a century, grown unaccustomed to the annoyance and vexation incident to their collection. It soon, however, became apparent that the gigantic struggle in which the nation was engaged could not be successfully carried on without resort to internal taxation on a much more extensive scale than ever before. Accordingly the law known as the Internal Revenue law was passed, and approved July 1, 1862. This law created the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Under its operation, scarcely anything tangible or intangible, from which revenue could be obtained, escaped taxation. Besides distilled spirits, fermented liquors and tobacco, it taxed trades and occupations, gross receipts and sales, dividends and incomes, articles not consumed in the use, manufactures, legacies and successions. It required a license tax from bankers, auctioneers, wholesale and retail dealers in distilled spirits, fermented liquors and wines; from pawnbrokers, rectifiers, distillers and brewers; from hotel, inn and tavern-keepers; from all steamers and vessels upon waters of the United States; from commercial, land warrant and other brokers; from tobacconists, theatres, circuses and jugglers; from carpenters; from horse-dealers, livery stable-keepers and cattle brokers; from tallow-chandlers and soap-makers; from peddlers and apothecaries, manufacturers and photographers, lawyers, physicians, surgeons and dentists; and also from claim and patent agents. It taxed mineral coals, candles, illuminating gas, coal illuminating oil, ground coffee and spices, refined and brown sugar, confectionery, saleratus, starch, gunpowder, white lead, clock movements, umbrellas and parasols; railroad iron of almost every description; band, hoop and sheet iron; stoves and hollowware; paper, soap, salt, pickles, glue and gelatine; patent, sole, harness, band and offal leather; calf, goat, horse and hog-skins; varnish and furs; diamonds and cotton; auction sales; carriages, yachts, billiard-tables and plate; cattle, hogs and sheep, slaughtered or for sale; railroads, steamboats and ferry-boats; railroad bonds; banks, trust companies, savings institutions and insurance companies; the salaries and pay of officers and persons in the service of the United States, whether civil, military, naval or other; passports, advertisements and all incomes in excess of $600. Stamp duties were laid on agreements, bank checks, inland bills of exchange, foreign bills of exchange and letters of credit, bills of lading, express receipts and stamps, surety bonds, certificates of stock, charter-parties, contracts, conveyances and telegraphic despatches; life, fire and marine insurance policies or leases, mortgages, passage-tickets, powers of attorney, probates of wills, protests, warehouse receipts, writs or other original legal process in all Courts of record whether law or equity; on medicines and preparations, perfumery, cosmetics and playing-cards. As if seized with desperation, Congress seemed determined to tax everybody and everything.

The internal taxes imposed by the law of July 1, 1862, have been gradually reduced as the money needs of the Government have diminished. The act of May 31, 1868, relieved the manufactures of the country except those of distilled spirits, fermented liquors and tobacco, of all taxation. The act of July 14, 1870, repealed the tax on legacies and successions. The act of June, 1872, made other large reductions. It did away with the tax on incomes after that tax had yielded a total revenue during the 10 years it was in force of $346,911,760.48; abolished all stamp taxes under Schedule B (1864) except that of 2 cents on bank checks, drafts and orders, and reduced the sources of Internal Revenue to about what they are at present, with the exception of the tax on oleomargarine which was laid by the act of Aug. 2, 1886.

The following table shows the receipts of the United States from Internal Revenue from March 4, 1792, to the end of the year 1820:

1792	$ 208,942.81	1802	$ 621,898.89
1793	337,705.70	1803	215,179.69
1794	274,089.62	1814	1,662,084.82
1795	337,755.36	1815	4,678,059.07
1796	475,289.60	1816	5,124,708.31
1797	575,491.45	1817	2,678,100.77
1798	644,357.95	1818	955,270.80
1799	779,136.44	1819	229,593.63
1800	809,396.55	1820	106,260.53
1801	1,048,033.43		

Since the establishment of the Bureau of Internal Revenue the principal sources of Internal Revenue have been distilled spirits, tobacco and fermented liquors. In the first three columns of the table given below will be found the receipts from taxes on these articles respectively, and in the fourth the Internal Revenue receipts from all sources by fiscal years, that is from Sept. 1, 1862, to June 30, 1889:[1]

FISCAL YEARS ENDED JUNE 30.	DISTILLED SPIRITS.	FERMENTED LIQUORS.	TOBACCO.	FROM ALL SOURCES. AGGREGATE RECEIPTS.
1863	$5,176,530.50	$1,628,933.82	$3,097,620.47	$41,003,192.93
1864	30,329,149.53	2,290,009.14	8,592,098.98	116,965,578.26
1865	18,731,422.45	3,734,928.06	11,401,373.10	210,855,864.53
1866	33,268,171.82	5,220,552.72	16,531,007.83	310,120,448.13
1867	33,542,951.72	6,057,500.63	19,765,148.41	265,064,938.43
1868	18,655,630.90	5,955,868.92	18,730,095.32	190,374,925 59
1869	45,071,230.86	6,099,879.54	23,430,707.57	159,124,126.86
1870	55,606,094.15	6,319,126.90	31,350,707.88	184,302,828.34
1871	46,281,848.10	7,389,501.82	33,578,907.18	143,198,322.10
1872	49,475,516.36	8,258,498.46	33,736,170.52	130,890,096.90
1873	52,099,371.78	9,324,937.84	34,386,303.09	113,504,012.80
1874	49,444,089.85	9,304,679.72	33,242,875.62	102,191,016.98
1875	52,081,991.12	9,144,004.41	37,303,461.88	110,071,515.00
1876	56,426,365.13	9,571,280.66	39,795,339.91	116,768,096.22
1877	57,469,429.72	9,480,789.17	41,106,546.92	118,549,230.25
1878	50,420,815.80	9,937,051.78	40,091,754.67	110,654,163.37
1879	52,570,284.69	10,729,320.08	40,135,002.65	113,449,621.38
1880	61,185,508.79	12,829,802.84	38,870,140.08	123,981,916.10
1881	67,153,974.88	13,700,241.21	42,854,991.31	135,229,912.30
1882	69,873,408.18	16,153,920.42	47,391,988.91	146,523,273.72
1883	74,368,775.20	16,900,615.81	42,104,249.79	144,553,344.86
1884	76,905,385.26	18,084,954.11	26,062,399.98	121,590,039.83
1885	67,511,208.63	18,230,782.03	26,407,088.48	112,421,121.07
1886	69,092,266.00	19,676,731.29	27,907,362.53	116,902,869.44
1887	65,829,321.71	21,922,187.49	30,108,067.13	118,837,301.06
1888	69,306,166.41	23,324,218.48	30,662,431.52	124,326,475.32
1889	74,312,206.33	23,723,835.26	31,866,860.42	130,894,434.20
Totals.	$1,402,189,115.87	$304,994,152.61	$810,510,702.15	$3,812,348,665.97

These figures represent a taxation on an aggregate of 1,553,151,463 gallons of distilled spirits, 319,519,854 barrels of beer, 65,871,265,481 cigars and cigarettes and 3,199,549,552 pounds of manufactured tobacco and snuff, from Sept. 1, 1862, to June 30, 1889.

There are many points of view from which the production and consumption of spirits may be examined and judged. There are the fiscal, the technic, the medicinal and the moral points of view. The minister of finance sees in them a rich source of revenue to the state ; the pharmaceutist, a solvent of medical agents ; the manufacturer, a component element in many useful commodities ; the moralist, frequently and with good reason, only a deadly poison that ruins the health, dims the intellect and damns the soul. Everything considered, however, he cannot be considered a wild fanatic who desires the disappearance of alcohol from the face of the earth; for its consumption, for the most part, is not reproductive of wealth, and the labor and capital incorporated in the finished product perishes in the use; while had they been employed in the building of houses or the purchase of farms or the construction of canals or railways, they would have added, since 1863, over fifteen hundred million dollars to the aggregate wealth of the people, and afforded the Treasury an enduring instead of an evanescent subject of taxation—a subject which besides would grow in value and in productiveness to the national revenues from year to year. The manufacturer, if alcohol went out of existence, would most likely be supplied with substitutes for it by his own ingenuity or by the bountifulness of nature. Thus when the manufacture of "burning fluid" entirely ceased because of the rise of alcohol to $4 per gallon, the public experienced no great inconvenience; for it happened that vast and natural supplies of petroleum were discovered in Pennsylvania, and the employment of its distillates for illuminating purposes is almost coincident in point of time with the compulsory disuse of burning fluid. So, also, varnish-makers, who, when alcohol could be purchased at about 50 cents per gallon, used it in great quantities, substituted, when the price reached eight times that figure, other and cheaper solvents for their gums. The manufacturers of quinine likewise, for a like reason, replaced it as a solvent for the alkaloids of the cinchona bark with the distillates of petroleum with such success that it is doubtful whether the old processes would be again resorted to if alcohol could be purchased at its former prices. In medicines, although sometimes useful and of extensive employment, especially as the solvent of the active principles of many substances, it is safe to say that the relief it has afforded in disease and the lives it has saved are an insignificant quantity compared with the misery, the suffering, the pauperism, the mortality and the woes unmeasured which it has caused.

---

[1] The figures also include receipts from special taxes on rectifiers, brewers and wholesale and retail liquor-dealers.

The man who goes even to the extreme of demanding that it shall no longer be produced for any purpose, since its legitimate use seems to be the rare exception and its abuse the rule, cannot be called a wild fanatic. It must be remembered that the direful effects of alcoholic intoxication do not stop at the individual, but extend to his progeny and to the race. Immorality, depravation, alcoholic excesses, brutalization, appear in the first generation; hereditary drunkenness, maniacal attacks and general paralysis in the second; hypochondriacal melancholia, insanity and homicidal tendencies in the third ; in the fourth, degeneration is complete—the child is born either an imbecile or an idiot, or, if not, soon becomes one. No wonder, therefore, that an ever-increasing number of men of all shades of religions and of no religious belief are convinced that civilization would be the gainer if alcohol had never been known, and if the art of manufacturing it were forever numbered among the arts irretrievably lost.

J. J. LALOR.

[For details of the Internal Revenue laws, see UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC. For numbers of liquor-dealers, etc., see LIQUOR TRAFFIC.]

Note by the Editor.—The imposition of heavy Federal taxes on liquors, when first proposed, was bitterly resisted by many representative persons engaged in the traffic. At that time liquor production and selling were carried on promiscuously, and the manufacturers and dealers had no powerful trade organizations. The first effects of the law were to compel capitalization of the distilling and brewing interests, and to promote compact and intelligent organization. It was no longer possible to profitably operate a still or a brewery with insignificant capital and careless business methods. It also became necessary to establish intimate relations with Federal officials and influential politicians. Accordingly, the national whiskey power and the national beer power were rapidly developed. They acquired absolute control over Congress and the Internal Revenue Bureau. There have been many offensive exhibitions of legislative and official subserviency; the great whiskey frauds perpetrated in Grant's administration, the repeated expressions of friendship for the liquor interests made by Commissioners of Internal Revenue and the practical remission of whiskey taxes by Secretaries of the Treasury, are especially memorable. (For details, see UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.)

Under the Internal Revenue law the beverage consumption of liquor has increased enormously, both the aggregate consumption and the per capita consumption. (See CONSUMPTION OF LIQUORS.) All the facts, indeed, point to the conclusion that this system of Federal regulation and taxation has been very disastrous to the interests of the temperance movement. We briefly present some of the most important testimony:

1. The distillers and brewers, practically without division, sustain the Internal Revenue law as it now exists, and sturdily oppose efforts to modify it. The Republican party, which formulated the law and has retained it on the statute-books, certainly cannot be charged with a disposition to unfairly represent any of its practical results. In 1888, the Republican National Convention incorporated the following significant words in that part of its platform which proposed plans for reducing the surplus revenues of the Federal Government: "If there shall still remain a larger revenue than is requisite for the wants of the Government, we favor the entire repeal of Internal taxes rather than the surrender of any part of our Protective system at the joint behest of the whiskey trusts and the agents of foreign manufacturers." This was an implied admission that the distillers desired the abolition of customs duties rather than of the liquor taxes—in fact, that they were so earnest in fighting for the preservation of the Internal Revenue system as to join hands with the "agents of foreign manufacturers" in an attack upon the Protective tariff.

During recent sessions of Congress, the distillers have had powerful lobbies at Washington to oppose any legislation looking to a repeal of the Internal Revenue taxes. The very well-informed Washington correspondent of the New York *Tribune*, at the opening of Congress in 1887, sent this statement to his paper:

> "The big whiskey manufacturers who have been striving for seven or eight years to escape the payment of the taxes on whiskey manufactured by them, and yet who are bitterly opposed to the repeal or reduction of that tax, have their representatives already on the ground to prevent any legislation in that direction. They will make a strong fight against even the proposition to relieve from Internal taxation, under proper safeguards, alcohol used in manufactures and the mechanical arts. They will also fight the proposition to repeal the tax on spirits distilled from fruits, on the ground that those distillers, if relieved from Government inspection and supervision, will proceed to grain distillation."

Leading representatives of the distilling interests, in interviews in the *Voice* for Dec. 22 and 29, 1887, admitted that their policy was to prevent abolition of the liquor taxes. John M. Atherton, President of the National Protective Association of distillers and liquor-dealers, in stating the reasons for this attitude, said:

> "Under the Government supervision there are certain marks, stamps, gauges, etc., put on every barrel of whiskey, which serve to identify it. These form an absolute guaranty from the Government, a disinterested party of the highest authority, to the genuineness of the goods. There is such a tendency to adulteration that this guaranty is of great value. Next, if the general Government laid no tax upon whiskey the States almost certainly would. As they are under no compact to lay the same tax, the rate would almost certainly be unequal. For instance, with a tax of 25 cents a gallon on the whiskey produced in Kentucky the State would have an abundant revenue for all her needs, without taxing anything else at all. But it might happen that Ohio and Indiana would lay no tax, or a very light one, upon whiskey. In that case Kentucky distillers would be compelled to manufacture at a very great disadvantage, and would, in fact, be compelled to close altogether. A tax by the National Government bears on all States alike, and affords a fair field for competition."[1]

The United States Brewers' Convention for 1888, held at St. Paul, May 30 and 31, made an elaborate plea in favor of retaining the taxes. The following is an extract:

> "The old objection urged against excises could not at present be revived, seeing that those who have to bear the tax and all the inconveniences that are said to grow out of its alleged obnoxious features, are perfectly satis-

---

[1] The *Voice*, Dec. 29, 1887.

fied with their present status, so that, as we have stated on another occasion, whatever commiseration may be felt for them by certain theorists is just so much sympathy wasted. As far as the brewers of this country are concerned, it is well known that, so far from opposing an excise, they materially aided the Government during the incipient stages of the system in making the tax collectable as cheaply and conveniently as possible. Their action at that time was not only prompted by the intention to prevent injustice being done them, but also, in a very large measure, by patriotic motives; while their present course [of non-interference with the Federal tax] is dictated not only by industrial considerations, but also by the conviction, sustained by the experience of our own people and the people of many other civilized countries, that the present system, while perfectly justifiable when viewed from the standpoint of political economy, promotes temperance more effectually than any other measure yet proposed or executed for that purpose. . . . To judge from present indications, there is no danger of a reduction of Internal Revenue, other than that derived from articles which do not concern us industrially."

2. The temperance people condemn the whole system and declare that it hinders successful work. Some of their organizations are not outspoken, but it is well understood that the advanced temperance societies are practically unanimous in desiring unconditional repeal. "We advocate the abolition of the Internal Revenue on alcoholic liquors and tobacco," said the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union in 1887, "for the reason that it operates to render more difficult the securing and enforcement of Prohibitory laws, and so postpones the day of national deliverance."

3. The object of the law is "revenue only." It was not enacted as a temperance measure, and to promote temperance is no part of the duties of its administrators. So long as it exists, the liquor policy of the United States Government, theoretically and practically, is wholly antagonistic to Prohibition. By the provisions of this act the Prohibitory policy of various States, counties and towns is ignored by the Federal Government. Federal officials connected with the Internal Revenue service in the Prohibition States and localities possess abundant evidence of violations of State and local Prohibitory regulations; yet these officials refuse to co-operate with State and local authorities. Moreover, they constantly interfere with the work of enforcement, and become responsible for many misleading representations that are eagerly repeated by the enemies of Prohibition. The payment of special liquor taxes to the Federal Collectors by individuals in the Prohibitory States provides statistics that are deemed especially serviceable by unscrupulous anti-Prohibition advocates. It is assumed that all who pay these taxes are liquor-dealers within the ordinary meaning of the term; and where the Federal records show a large number of such payments it is declared that State Prohibitory laws are ineffective and farcical. These Federal records, however, are absolutely worthless as records of the number of persons actually engaged in the liquor traffic in a given State. (See PROHIBITION, BENEFITS OF.) But this fact is not given due weight by the ordinary public; and the Federal returns for the States where Prohibition is the law are therefore used to persuade the people that "Prohibition doesn't prohibit."

Inter-State Commerce.—See UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Intoxicants.—See MALT LIQUORS, VINOUS LIQUORS and SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS.

Iowa. - See Index.

Ireland.—The war against drink in Ireland began about 1826 with the formation of a total abstinence society in Skibbereen, County Wexford, by Jeffery Sedwards, a nailor. In 1829 the Ulster Temperance Society (against distilled liquors only) was founded at Belfast by the Rev. Dr. Edgar and other pioneers. From this time until 1838 a large number of similar societies were established in different parts of the country and numerous adherents were enrolled. In 1838 Father Mathew's memorable temperance crusade began. During its progress more than 5,000,000 people, in a total population of a little more than 8,000,000, took the teetotal pledge. By 1842 the drink traffic had been terribly crippled: many distilleries and breweries had been forced to close, public-houses were deserted or put to better uses, drunkenness disappeared in many parts of Ireland, and the criminal calendars at assizes were almost blank. The annual consumption of spirits dropped from 11,595,536 gallons in 1837 to 6,485,443 gallons in 1841. But this triumph was short-lived. From want of a Prohibitory law the liquor traffic gradually recovered its strength. Drink is again the great curse of Ireland.

The "Report of the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Inland Revenue" for the year ending March 31, 1889, shows that the population of Ireland at that time was 4,790,614.[1] During the year, 29 distilleries were at work, producing 11,357,183 gallons of spirits; 146,404 quarters of malt, 178,435 quarters of unmalted grain, 36,795 cwt. of molasses, 13,130 cwt. of rice and 6,694 cwt. of sugar were destroyed in distillation; there were 6,812,048 gallons of spirits on which duty was charged; there were 25,256,788 gallons of spirits remaining in bonded warehouses, and the Excise duties on spirits amounted to £3,390,528. In the same year there were 2,346,682 barrels of beer charged with duty; 2,320,217 barrels were retained for consumption, and the Excise duties charged on beer amounted to £721,344. The total number of licenses of all kinds was 24,574, of which 16,924 were to retailers of spirits (publicans) and 5,252 were "occasional licenses for sale of spirits;" while 607 were to wholesale dealers in spirits, 384 to wholesale dealers in beer, 409 to retailers of beer and wine for consumption off the premises, 127 to retailers of beer and cider for consumption on the premises, 28 to retailers of beer and wine for consumption on the premises, 274 to spirit grocers, and the remainder to various other dealers. Of the 16,924 publicans, 13,186 had ordinary seven-day licenses; 2,653 were licensed to sell on six days only; 128 were licensed on condition that they would close one hour before the statute time, and 958 had licenses conditioned on both Sunday closing and early closing.

In Belfast, Dublin, Cork, Limerick and Waterford, the public houses sell on week-days from 7 A. M. to 11 P. M., on Sundays from 2 P. M. to 7 P. M., and on Christmas day and Good Friday from 2 P. M. to 9 P. M. In all other places over 5,000 population the hours for sale are the same, excepting that no sales at all can be made on Sundays. In places of less than 5,000 population the hours on week-days are 7 A. M. to 10 P. M., no sales are permitted on Sundays, and on Christmas and Good Friday 2 P. M. to 7 P. M. All licenses are for one year only. Applications for license may be refused on the score of the bad character, misconduct or unfitness of the applicant, of the objectionable nature of the place or of the presence of a sufficiently large number of previously licensed houses in the neighborhood. Practically, the people have little or no power to prevent the licensing of drink-shops. Besides the ordinary alcoholic beverages, considerable quantities of sulphuric ether were sold without license and consumed in some parts of Ulster, especially in Counties Tyrone and Londonderry. This ether has very injurious effects.

The Registrar-General's "Report on the Criminal and Judicial Statistics of Ireland" for 1888 shows that 87,582 cases of drunkenness were disposed of summarily in the police and petty sessions Courts—an increase of 10.2 per cent. over 1887. According to these records, there is annually one conviction for every 54 of the population of Ireland. There were 2,855 cases of "habitual drunkenness"—persons convicted three or more times for being drunk,—or 266 more than in 1887.

Even these figures only partially indicate the woes brought upon Ireland by whiskey. If drink impairs the prosperity and energies of the richest nations, its effects must be unspeakable in such a country as Ireland,—a country of famines, with a decreasing population, poverty-stricken and wretched. The following is a most instructive statement of conditions, from a very high statistical authority:

> "Ireland's place in the national economy [of the United Kingdom] is not very high, its contribution to the Imperial exchequer for stamps and taxes being but £1,003 667, against £1,921,640 Scotland, £24,716,323 England and Wales, and £27,673,012 for the United Kingdom. The duty on whiskey, however, comes to

---

[1] The population of Ireland on April 3, 1881, was 5,174,836. Unlike any other portion of the British dominions, it is on the decrease. . . . The highest point was reached in 1845, when the entire population was estimated at 8,175,124. The potato crop, upon which all the agricultural and many of the manufacturing poor depended for their subsistence, having failed for two successive years, produced famine and disease, which carried off large numbers and gave a great impulse to emigration, so that from 1845 the population rapidly decreased. In 1851 there were 6,552,385 persons in the country; in 1861, 5,798,564; in 1871, 5,412,377, and in 1881, 5,174,836. Since 1845 the decrease has been 3,120,225, equal to 37.6 per cent.—*Whitaker's Almanac for* 1890, p. 817.

the rescue, and brings no less than £3,364,875 into the national exchequer. The deficiency on the other items of national revenue is largely accounted for by the poverty of the great mass of the people, of whom no fewer than 522,000 were last year [1889] in a state of actual pauperism. There must be something radically wrong in this, for if the country could, as it did in 1845, support more than eight millions of people, there should not be any great difficulty in providing for the five millions remaining in 1889."[1]

The Irish Temperance League is the chief anti-liquor organization, with headquarters in Belfast (John Grubb Richardson of Bessbrook, President). Its object is "the suppression of drunkenness by moral suasion, legislative Prohibition and all other lawful means." It publishes the national Irish temperance newspaper, the *Irish Temperance League Journal* (Belfast, monthly), sends out lecturers, operates 17 street coffee-stands in Belfast, conducts one of the most elegant and successful temperance cafes in the United Kingdom, and has charge of the legislative movements for entire Sunday-closing and the "Direct Veto." The various churches, especially the Episcopalian, Presbyterian and Methodist, perform important temperance work, and the utterances made by their representative gatherings are becoming more aggressive. The Good Templars and Rechabites are growing in numbers and influence. Encouragement is given to the cause by some of the leading Roman Catholic dioceses, notably by Archbishop Walsh of Dublin. Definite political progress is interfered with by the commanding nature of the Home Rule agitation. A. H. H. McMurtry.

Italy.[2]—This country ranks after France among wine-producing nations, the annual vintage ranging from 600,000,000 to 800,000,000 gallons. In all ages since the beginning of civilization, the growing of the grape and making of wine have been among the chief industries. At present the Italian wines, though abundant, are not "pushed" in the market so assiduously as the French and those of some other European countries. Italian usages and tastes are to a greater degree domestic and homely. The processes of manufacture are in many places of the most primitive kinds. It is not to be assumed, however, that the Italian brands of commerce, though possibly simpler, are necessarily purer. While this may be true of the wines made and consumed by the people in many parts of Italy, the liquor merchants who handle them in the various stages of commercial exchange take full advantage of the resources of adulteration.

It may be said, in general, that all Italians use wine. The common wine of the locality satisfies nearly all the people. Even the lees or dregs are utilized, though only among the poor; the Italian laborer, if unable to procure wine, will not drink water pure, but prefers to adulterate it with wine-lees. The practice of "treating" does not prevail to any great extent in Italy.

Among the better classes of the Italians, so-called moderation is probably the rule: to the cultivated people drunkenness is as repugnant as to the enlightened citizens of most countries. But drink is none the less the besetting foe of the poor, and crime, vice and poverty are harvested abundantly. Drunkenness is steadily on the advance, as shown by the constantly increasing quantities of distilled liquors manufactured, imported and consumed.

The number of places where alcoholic beverages are sold is enormous. All proprietors of liquor establishments must obtain licenses, which are good for one year only. Thus objectionable places can be closed by the authorities in a very short time, by refusing renewals of licenses; and a license can be revoked at any time on the ground of public safety or morality. Every permit involves individual responsibility, and any licensee who allows another person to carry on his business becomes liable to prosecution for illicit traffic. Each municipality fixes the hours for closing. In the event of any great disturbance or of the use of a drink-shop as a rendezvous for suspected persons, the Chief of Police may close the establishment for as long a period as one year.

The temperance movement as understood in English-speaking countries has not yet had birth in Italy. There is a temperance society with headquarters at Milan, but it is not based on teetotal principles and no results of its work are manifest.

Jamaica.—This important West India island is famed for its rum, distilled from the juice of the sugar-cane. It is an English colony, and the British Government has uniformly encouraged rum production, though raising a considerable revenue under a characteristic English system of excise. The relative magnitude of the rum "industry" will be seen from the following list of values of chief exports for the year 1888: Dyewoods, £360,750; tropical fruits, £337,652; coffee, £321,440; sugar, £288,402; rum, £202,420; pimento, £44,728. The following table shows the number of puncheons of rum (of 90 gallons each) exported, and their values, for a period of 10 years:

---

[1] Whitaker's Almanac for 1890, p. 318.

[2] The editor is indebted to Rev. Leroy M. Vernon, D. D., of Syracuse, N. Y., and Axel Gustafson.

YEARS.	PUNCHEONS.	VALUES.
1879	18,791	£197,320
1880	18,584	209,091
1881	13,952	174,406
1882	22,742	295,645
1883	20,349	225,963
1884	20,364	220,613
1885	21,991	234,053
1886	14,764	184,545
1887	24,126	301,574
1888	18,684	202,420

Although 45 per cent. of Jamaica's trade is with the United States, we receive comparatively little of her rum. Only 238 puncheons, valued at £2,586, were shipped to the United States in 1888. Yet so-called Jamaica rum is one of the commonest drinks sold in American barrooms.

An export duty of 2*s* 6*d* is levied by the Government on each puncheon. There are but very slight restrictions on the manufacture, the tax on each still being only £5 per annum. A yearly license to sell spirits by wholesale costs £10 in Kingston and £5 in each other parish; license to retail, £25 in Kingston, £20 in various other towns and £10 in each remaining locality; tavern license, £20 in Kingston and £10 in other parishes; hotel license, £10 in Kingston, £5 elsewhere. Import duties of 10*s* per gallon are charged on spirits, 6*d* per gallon on beer and 2*s* 6*d* per gallon on wine. The revenue receipts from rum duties average about £80,000 per year; for the first eight months of the fiscal year 1888–9, they amounted to £62,073, while the receipts from licenses in the same months reached £10,472. During the year 1888–9 there were issued 1,382 retailers', 32 wholesalers', 42 tavern and 4 hotel licenses.

Japan.—When Commodore M. C. Perry in 1854 made the treaty with Japan by which the long secluded nation re-opened intercourse with Christendom, he was regaled with a banquet at which the native *saké*, or rice spirit, was freely served. Tasting it and inquiring the price of the various brands, which seemed to him to be remarkably low as compared with the cost of food and clothing, he fell into profound thought. The Japanese officers, thinking he might be offended, asked him, through the interpreter, of what he was thinking. He replied that he considered it a great calamity to a nation to have intoxicating liquor so plentiful and so cheap. This gave his entertainers food for thought, and the words of the American Commodore (who, by the way, had already advocated the abolition of the grog ration in the navy, and whose fleet was the first governed without flogging or the use of the lash) were duly reported in Yedo.[1]

The national drink of the Japanese is brewed or distilled from rice, and the *saké* thus obtained is of varying strength, ranging from weakest beer to strongest brandy. Other intoxicating liquors are produced from sweet potatoes, molasses, grain, grapes, etc., but these are articles of local manufacture and are not in general use. The *saké* varies in alcoholic strength from 4 to 50, averaging about 15 per cent.; though the unexpelled fusel oil, which is abundant in the cheaper grades, has a maddening effect on the drinker and is in itself a specific as well as prolific source of crime. The word *saké* is probably a corruption of *masa-ke* or pure spirit, and is pictorially represented by the Chinese characters for "fluid" and "jar." The brewing industry was brought from Corea, and the drink has been known and made since the Christian era, but on a large scale only since the 16th Century. The old legends and mythology, as well as the ancient Shinto liturgies, make copious reference to it as the intoxicant of dragons and the offering acceptable to the gods. Itami and Ikeda, two places near Osaka, are famed as having the oldest breweries, from which millions of casks of liquor have gone, and to which thousands of horse-loads of silver have returned to enrich the brewers. "If you see one large, high, well-built house, standing in enclosed grounds, with a look of wealth about it, it is always that of the *saké* brewer," says Miss Bird. Though the Japanese of both sexes and of all classes drink *saké*, the universal consumption of tea has been a great safeguard to the nation, and the industry of *saké* brewing is relatively of less importance than the manufacture of beer in England.

---

[1] Life of Matthew C. Perry, p. 341.

Until 1878, the Government tax was but 10 per cent.; but in 1879 this was increased to one *yen* (73.4 cents) per *koku* (39.7 gallons). In 1880 this tax was doubled, and in 1883 doubled again, the tax being now about 7⅓ cents on a gallon. The effect of the tax has been to reduce the number of liquor-manufactories: in 1883 there were 25,814 breweries and distilleries; in 1884, 21,824; in 1885, 18,387; in 1886, 16,425, and in 1887, 15,025. The product in 1883 was: common *saké*, averaging about 12 per cent. of alcohol, 19,583,592 gallons; distilled spirits, 308,148 gallons; other kinds of *saké*, 361,084 gallons. Formerly the liquor manufactured in private vats or stills for family use, and prohibited from sale but not taxed, was unlimited in quantity, and no note of it was taken by Government. Since 1884 this private production has been put under the Excise laws, which limit the production to 39.4 gallons to one household, with a tax of 58 cents on the same. Taxation does not in this case seem to have diminished, but rather to have increased production. While in 1883, 495,758 *koku*, or in round numbers, 19,830,320 gallons of *saké* were made, the figures for the years 1884, 1885 and 1886, respectively, were 21,330,280, 22,919,800, and 25,291,480 gallons. The number of private brewers in 1883 was 670,361, and in 1886, 734,778. The Government is probably unwilling to impose a heavier tax on the *saké* industry, lest the country be flooded by the import of the Chinese article.

The consumption of foreign liquors is increasing, as the figures of the Bureau of Statistics in Tokio conclusively show. In 1883, the value of the various alcoholic liquors imported (chiefly from Europe) was $220,716, and in the following years until 1887, $224,782, $262,018, $358,598 and $615,063 respectively. The demand for beer is steadily increasing. Several native companies and one foreign company have been organized to manufacture beer, and the development of this new "industry" is likely to be rapid. The growth of beer-consumption is shown by the increase in the number of beer-shops in the city of Osaka from 13 in 1886 to 490 in 1888.[1] The British Consuls have advised the English brewers to pay especial attention to the Japan market. Foreign influence has not yet, however, inflicted the opium curse upon Japan. The poppy is grown to a limited extent, and some opium is imported, but the sale is subject to the strictest regulations and the opium habit does not prevail to any marked extent.

The estimated revenue from home-brewed *saké* for 1889–'90 is $10,642,019, or 18 per cent. of the total revenue of the Government. It is evident, however, that much more than the amount which comes under Government cognizance is produced, especially in the rural districts. "Taking into consideration," says Professor Atkinson, in his "Chemistry of *Saké* Brewing," "only the amount of ordinary *saké* used (in 1881), say 5,000,000 *koku*, or 198,000,000 gallons, the consumption corresponds to six gallons per head per annum, reckoning the population at 33,000,000. If it were diluted twice so as to be about the same strength as beer, the consumption would be doubled – that is, 12 gallons a head, while the consumption of beer in England averages 34 gallons per head, nearly three times as much as in Japan." We may add that the population of Japan by census completed Dec. 31, 1887, was 39,000,000, which number being divided into 144,887,600, the total present product of *saké* (40 gallons per *koku*), gives not quite four gallons per head. Combining the total consumption of foreign and native liquor, the average would be much higher, and probably nearly as high as in the days before the Perry era.

In addition to the tax on production, the Government requires retail dealers to pay about $5 for a license, which is for revenue only, and is not intended to restrict the sale. While taxation has reduced the number of breweries and distilleries, we are not to argue that the

---

[1] On the authority of Rev. H. J. Rhoades, American missionary in Tokio.

Japanese have become more temperate, and the situation morally is probably made worse since the introduction of European drinks. In their drinking habits, the Japanese consume in simple drinking but a trifling amount "on the premises" where bought, most of the tapsters (whose sign, by the way, is a bush of pine) supplying families or inns ("tea-houses") in wooden casks or measures of three different sizes – the *go* (1.27 gill), *chō* (1.58 quart) and *tō* (3.97 gallons). The liquid is usually drank hot, having been heated in decanters set in vessels of boiling water. The cups used are of the tiny sort, holding a half or quarter of a gill. Hence the sight of foreigners drinking out of tumblers and glasses, when first seen by a Japanese, suggests gluttony and drunkenness, or calls to mind the mythical *shō-ji*.[1] These red-haired beings are represented with long scarlet hair and long-handled dippers carousing around a huge jar of intoxicating liquor set near the sea-shore.

The major part of home-made liquor is used by the Japanese at meals, in cooking, at hotels, feasting, picnics and on social occasions, and the proportions and strength of the various kinds of alcoholic liquids is shown in the figures of production in 1880 : ordinary *saké*, 200,603,360 gallons; turbid *saké*, 2,519,760 gallons ; white *saké*, 60,000 gallons ; sweet *saké*, for cooking, 1,542,760 gallons; liqueur, 144,600 gallons; spirits, 3,348,320 gallons. The average Japanese, then, drinks a compound containing about 10 or 12 per cent. of alcohol, and the toper indulges in distilled *saké*, or whiskey. Whether the Japanese are a temperate or intemperate people is a question of relativity. A reader of books like those of Alcock, and others who wrote in the days when tipsy *rōnin* and two-sworded swash-bucklers roamed freely around, maddened with drink and ready to slice up dogs and foreigners alike, will get the idea that half the Japanese are nightly drunk. As a matter of undisputed fact, the curse of Japan, next to licentiousness, is drunkenness, and the typical rich man is the *saké* merchant. Seven per cent. of the entire rice crop (which is the principal crop) was, until lately, turned into *saké*. The drink habit is in Japan the fruitful cause of quarrels, murders, alienation of friends, ruin of families and manifold crimes ; and its associations are those of gluttony, excess, prostitution and waste. The Government statistics, it is hoped, will soon be applied to exploiting this whole subject. In the work of reform the outlook is hopeful. The Christian churches are on the side of temperance, and most of them favor total abstinence or Prohibition, and through the labors of earnest men and women, mostly American, temperance societies and literature have been introduced. Many high-minded natives give their co-operation in the warfare against drink, and the interests of the cause derive advantage from the precepts laid down in the sacred Buddhist books and the traditions against the use of alcoholic liquors that appeal to those adhering to the religion of their fathers. In some Buddhist sects total abstinence is rigidly practiced, but laxity is the rule and the priests are not generally disposed to insist on strict observance. But as compared with the situation in 1854, and despite the added curse of foreign importation, the outlook in 1890—the year of Japan's new Constitution and representative Government—is one of promise.

WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS.[2]

Jewett, Charles.—Died April 3, 1879. In 1826 he issued for private circulation an address in verse to the town authorities of Lisbon, Conn., his place of residence, setting forth the iniquity of granting liquor licenses. A little later he attended a course of medical lectures at Pittsfield, Mass., and in 1829 began the practice of medicine in East Greenwich, R. I. In 1832 he was married and the same year prepared an address on intemperance which was printed and widely circulated, and secured for him many appointments to speak. In 1835 he began the practice of his profession in Centreville, R. I. In 1837, through the instrumentality, largely, of Rev. Thomas P. Hunt, he gave up the practice of medicine to become agent for the Rhode Island State Temperance Society. His lectures were especially valuable and forcible at that time, since his medical training enabled him to treat the drink question in its scientific and physiological aspects. He was a delegate from Rhode Island to a notable temperance convention, held in Boston in 1839. In 1840 he accepted the position of Agent of the Massachusetts Temperance Union. In 1846 his contributions to the *Temperance Journal*, organ of the American Temperance Union, attracted notice. In 1849 friends presented him with a purse of $1,000, which enabled him to purchase a farm near Milbury, Mass., where he lived until 1854, when he removed to Faribault, Minn. While he was residing there he was beset with pecuniary embarrassments. These were relieved by his warm friends in the temperance work, John B. Gough and Lucius M. Sargent, each presenting him with a check for $500. Returning in 1855 to Massachusetts, he became Lecturer for the Temperance Alliance of that State. He published a book, "Forty Years' Fight with the Drink Demon," and throughout his life was a very prolific contributor to popular temperance literature.

---

[1] Japanese Fairy World, p. 102.

[2] The editor is also indebted to Rev. George G. Hudson, Wakayama, Japan, and Mary Clement Leavitt.

Jews.—No action on total abstinence or Prohibition has been taken by any representative body of the Jewish Church in America. Experience has shown that the general attitude of the Hebrews is opposed to radical measures. This statement is confirmed by Joseph Davis, editor of the *Hebrew Journal*, who writes: "Intemperance has not been a crying evil among the Jews, and has thus necessitated neither conference nor legislation. Individually the Jews are interested in the question only as American citizens. The general drift of opinion among our people is antagonistic to legislative Prohibition, but in favor of such regulation of the traffic as will afford least temptation to drinking outside the house."

[See also BIBLE WINES and PASSOVER WINES.]

Joy, Benjamin.—Born June 23, 1800, and died Feb. 18, 1869. He was one of the most active and indomitable pioneers of the temperance reform. He spent the largest portion of his life in Ludlowville, Tompkins County, N. Y. Being a merchant and manufacturer, his business interests caused him to travel extensively through the central and western parts of his State. In 1827, while visiting the neighboring town of Hector, he learned from Dr. Jewell that a society had been formed there on the pledge of total abstinence from wine, cider and all intoxicants. He returned home and organized a society on the same basis at Ludlowville, Dec. 31 of the same year. This was one of the earliest teetotal societies in the world. In his frequent trips through all that region, driving from schoolhouse to schoolhouse and church to church, he denounced the drinking usages and formed societies for the promotion of abstinence. His labors of love were without any "pay"—except the persecutions of the rumsellers, who cut the harness from his horse and endeavored to break up his meetings. Once they broke a whiskey-bottle near his head and the old hero shouted with great glee: "Good! my boys, good! served him right! one more devil cast out! I came here to help smash rum-bottles." Benjamin Joy was a most zealous Christian, and it was at a religious service held at his house, in February, 1843, that the author of this sketch decided to enter the Christian ministry. In 1865 he took a prominent part in the National Temperance Convention at Saratoga and stood with Mr. Delavan and Gerrit Smith in the leadership of the cause in the State of New York. The closing years of his noble life of philanthropy were spent in Penn Yan. His last evening on earth was in a meeting of Good Templars, where he spoke with great power. Before morning he died. His honored friend, Dr. John Bascom, adds the following testimony:

"Benjamin Joy was a very bright man, full of humor and an admirable story teller. He had a pliant, expressive face that gave a running commentary on what he said and a pictorial enforcement of it. He shared the interest of his topic with his audience, and it was evidently a pleasure for him to speak. He was also a very devout man. The strenuous way in which he enforced social truth, both on the question of slavery and of temperance and his personal resources in gathering pleasant and aidful material in support of his theme, constituted one of the strongest and most beneficent impressions of my childhood and youth."

Rev. Dr. David Magee writes:

"No one can forget the addresses of Mr. Joy. How his eye kindled and the tones of his voice deepened as he became more and more engaged, his address overflowing with wit and humor, then melting into pathos, rising at times into the keenest sarcasm and occasionally into terrible invective. For 45 years he gave, without remuneration, his time and strength and talents to this work. In 1853 he was elected to the Legislature on the temperance issue, and of him a journalist of that day (T. W. Brown) wrote: 'No man at the capital, as a man, a temperance advocate or a legislator, wields more moral power than he. As a debater he is clear-headed, cool, self-poised and ready, and never surprised in any of the strategy which marks the stirring conflicts of the session. His enemies love him while they fear him. As a speaker, no man holds in more complete subjection the turbulent elements of the House.' Mr. Joy was especially instrumental in framing the Prohibitory law which was finally passed, only to be vetoed by Governor Horatio Seymour. Only three weeks before his death he delivered his annual address to the people of Tompkins County, in which he said: 'By every throb of affection, by every memory of the kindness of the people of Tompkins to myself, I long and pray for their deliverance and the deliverance of their children from the scourge and curse of strong drink. And now, after a world of experience and observation, chastened by many trials, far along in the autumn of life, with the headlands of another world plainly visible, I solemnly declare that the importance of the subject of temperance grows in my esteem with advancing years, and I thoroughly justify every endeavor, every labor, every "forced march" and exposure, every sacrifice I have ever made for the cause, and have only to regret that I could not have done more.'"

THEODORE L. CUYLER.

Kansas.—See Index.

Kentucky.—See Index.

Knights of Temperance.—A juvenile temperance society, organized in 1885, under the auspices of the Church Temperance Society (Protestant Episcopal) and designed for boys and young men from 14 to 21 years of age. There is no element of secrecy, though none but members are expected to attend the regular meetings. Every Company has a Captain and nine other officers. The following pledge is taken by each member:

"I promise with the help of God to abstain wholly from strong drink as long as I continue a member of this Order. Moreover, I acknowledge it always to be my duty to avoid whatever words and deeds are indecent or profane. I distinctly understand that to break this promise which I have just made, or to be guilty of any word or act indecent or profane, will make me liable to suspension or dismissal from this Order."

Koran.—See MOHAMMEDANS.

Labor and Liquor.[1] — The economic arguments against the liquor traffic have always found their strongest support in the unhesitating recognition that, whatever may be said of the effort to stop drinking, it is wholly beneficent and righteous when considered from the standpoint of the laboring man's interests. To establish the unmitigated evil and folly of drink indulgence among the poor, it was indeed never necessary that a distinctive temperance movement should be created. Ordinary observation and intelligence were sufficient. Long before teetotal or even "moderation" societies were founded, Benjamin Franklin wrote this interesting reminiscence of his apprenticeship in Watt's printing-house in London in 1725:

"I drank only water; the other workmen, nearly fifty in number, were great drinkers of beer. On occasion I carried up and down stairs a large form of types in each hand, when others carried but one in both hands. They wondered to see, from this and several instances, that the Water-American, as they called me, was stronger than themselves, who drank strong beer. We had an ale-house boy, who attended always in the house to supply the workmen. My companion at the press drank every day a pint before breakfast, a pint at breakfast with his bread and cheese, a pint between breakfast and dinner, a pint at dinner, a pint in the afternoon about 6 o'clock, and another when he had done his day's work. I thought it a detestable custom, but it was necessary, he supposed, to drink strong beer that he might be strong to labor. I endeavored to convince him that the bodily strength afforded by beer could only be in proportion to the grain or flour of the barley dissolved in the water of which it was made; that there was more flour in a pennyworth of bread, and therefore if he could eat that with a pint of water it would give him more strength than a quart of beer. He drank on, however, and had four or five shillings to pay out of his wages every Saturday night for that vile liquor; an expense I was free from. And thus these poor devils keep themselves always under."[2]

When practical organized work for temperance was begun in the United States, one of the first steps taken was the discountenancing of the practice of serving liquor to farm-hands. The especial object of Father Mathew's great crusade was to reform the drinking habits of the poor people. Moral suasion undertakings have always been prosecuted peculiarly for the elevation of the masses. The whole drink problem has its root in the frightful excesses, suffering and poverty inflicted on the multitude by alcohol; and the continuance of the temperance reform as a necessarily permanent factor of modern propagandism is justified and made certain by nothing so much as by the universal conviction that drink is one of the worst obstacles to the moral and material betterment of the working classes, now so earnestly striven for by vast organizations and regarded by most good people as a chief aim of humane endeavor.

---

[1] The editor is indebted to Frank J. Sibley of Demorest, Ga., Ralph J. Beaumont of Addison, N. Y., and A. M. Dewey, formerly editor of the *Journal of United Labor*.

[2] Franklin's Autobiography ("Works," edited by Jared Sparks, Boston, 1840), vol. 1, p. 59.

But not until recently has the formal co-operation of influential Labor forces and representative Labor leaders in the radical temperance agitation been vouchsafed to any important extent. Upon the formation of the widespread American Order of Knights of Labor in 1878, a clause was inserted in the constitution providing that no saloon-keeper, bartender or any person in any way connected with the liquor traffic, should be eligible to membership. The reasons governing this action were thus expressed by John B. Chisholm, a Pennsylvania miner, who was the author of the clause: "I want to save this Order from the evil which has been the curse of every organization of miners in the history of the Labor movement. I want the Knights of Labor to succeed, and this they can never do if in any way contaminated with that which does only harm to the human family. The saloon has no real sympathy for labor, and only robs the worker of the hard-earned money which ought to go for the comforts of wife and little ones at home." The Knights of Labor have adhered to the policy originally adopted, and in 1887 their attitude was emphasized by the addition of the following amendment to their constitution by the consent of more than two-thirds of the Assemblies:

> "No Local or other Assembly member shall directly or indirectly give, sell or have any ale, beer or intoxicating liquors of any kind at any meeting, party, sociable, ball, picnic or entertainment pertaining to the Order. Any member found guilty of violating this law shall be suspended not less than six months, or expelled. No fine shall be imposed for this offense. Any Local or other Assembly so offending shall be suspended during the pleasure of the General Executive Board, or shall have its charter revoked by said Board."

Necessarily the position taken by so powerful an organization as the Knights of Labor, with a membership in excess of 200,000, was a great advantage to the temperance cause. In various practical ways the most radical anti-liquor principles have been promoted by the Knights. Mr. T. V. Powderly, the head of the Order, and the other general officers, have publicly taken pledges to abstain entirely from the use of intoxicating liquors during their terms of office. In impassioned addresses and writings that have been conspicuously published, the foremost leaders have repeatedly arraigned drink as the worst enemy of the general interests of organized Labor as well as of individual workingmen.[1] They have also

---

[1] The following is from a letter published by Mr. Powderly in the *Journal of United Labor* for July 2, 1887:

"I know that in the organization of which I am the head there are many good men who drink, but they would be better men if they did not drink. I know that there are thousands in our Order who will not agree with me on the question of temperance, but that is their misfortune, for they are wrong, radically wrong. Ten years ago I was hissed because I advised men to let strong drink alone. They threatened to rotten-egg me. I have continued to advise men to be temperate, and though I have had no experience that would qualify me to render an opinion on the efficacy of a rotten egg as an ally of the rum-drinker, yet I would prefer to have my exterior decorated from summit to base with the rankest kind of rotten eggs rather than allow one drop of liquid villainy to pass my lips or have the end of my nose illuminated by the blossom that follows a planting of the seeds of hatred, envy, malice and damnation, all of which are represented in a solitary glass of gin. . . .

"He [the drunkard] robs parents, wife and children. He robs his aged father and mother through love of drink. He gives for rum what should go for their support. When they murmur he turns them from his door, and points his contaminated drunken finger toward the poorhouse. He next turns toward his wife and robs her of what should be devoted to the keeping of her home in comfort and plenty. He robs her of her wedding-ring and pawns it for drink. He turns his daughter from his door in a fit of drunken anger and drives her to the house of prostitution, and then accepts from her hand the proceeds of her shame. To satisfy his love of drink he takes the price of his child's virtue and innocence from her sin-stained, lust-bejewelled fingers, and with it totters to the bar to pay it to the man who 'does not deny the justice of my position.' I do not arraign the man who drinks because he is poor, but because through being a slave to drink he has made himself and family poor. I do not hate the man who drinks, for I have carried drunken men to their homes on my back rather than allow them to remain exposed to inclement weather. I do not hate the drunkard—he is what drink effected; and while I do not hate the effect, I abhor and loathe the cause. . .

"In the city of New York alone it is estimated that not less than $250,000 a day are spent for drink, $1,500,000 in one week, $75,000,000 in one year. Who will dispute it when I say that one-half of the policemen of New York City are employed to watch the beings who squander $75,000,000? Who will dispute it when I say that the money spent in paying the salaries and expenses of one-half of the police of New York could be saved to the taxpayers if $75,000,000 were not devoted to making drunkards, thieves, prostitutes and other subjects for the policemen's net to gather in? If $250,000 go over the counters of the rumseller in one day in New York City alone, who will dare to assert that workingmen do not pay one-fifth, or $50,000, of that sum? If workingmen in New York City spend $50,000 a day for drink, they spend $300,000 a week, leaving Sunday out. In four weeks they spend $1,200,000—over twice as much money as was paid into the General Assembly of the Knights of Labor in nine years. In six weeks they spend $1,800,000—nearly three times as much money as that army of organized workers, the Knights of Labor, have spent from the day the General Assembly was first called to order up to the present day; and in one year the workingmen of New York City alone will have spent for beer and rum $15,600,000, or enough to purchase and equip a first-class telegraph line of their own:—$15,600,000, enough money to invest shown their opposition to the license system by advising their followers to support Prohibitory Amendments to State Constitutions. In the Pennsylvania Amendment campaign, the *Journal of United Labor*, official organ of the Order, emphatically endorsed Prohibition in preference to High License.[1]

In the article on FARMERS it is shown that the agricultural organizations of the United States, forming a highly important branch of the Labor movement, are outspoken and aggressive foes of the saloon. The Catholic Total Abstinence Societies, whose membership is made up chiefly from the ranks of the laboring people, are constantly spreading the principles of personal temperance among the wage-workers. The influence of an increasing number of very eminent and earnest Catholic divines, like Bishops Ireland and Spalding, and of humbler though none the less energetic members of the clergy like Father Martin Mahoney of Minnesota, is no doubt responsible for much of the sturdy sentiment that is being developed. In other countries there is a growing recognition by Labor advocates of the necessity of combating drink. In one of the greatest strikes ever inaugurated and won in England, that of the London dock-laborers in the winter of 1889–90, the leader, John Burns, was a total abstainer, and his success was attributed to his efforts in behalf of sobriety among the men, as much as to any instrumentality. Michael Davitt, one of the most beloved of the Irish popular leaders, wrote in a letter to the Convention of the League of the Cross at Thurles, Ireland, July 23, 1889: "The fact that, poor as our country is, we waste over £11,000,000 a year on intoxicating drinks is a most deplorable one to dwell upon. Half that sum, needlessly wasted as it is now, would set every woolen mill in Ireland running to-morrow, and be thereby the means of keeping our young people from running out of the country for want of employment."

But while temperance radicalism is no longer exceptional among those best qualified to speak for Labor, it is not to be denied that much work must be done before the hostility or indifference of the masses can be overcome. This is so well attested by the multiplication of dram-shops in the poorer parts of every city that it is unnecessary to call attention to details.

[For information concerning labor employed by the liquor traffic, etc., see LIQUOR TRAFFIC. For testimony as to the advantages derived by wage-workers from Prohibitory systems, see PROHIBITION, BENEFITS OF.]

Law and Order Leagues.—In a very large number of American cities the liquor regulations instituted by State authorities are distasteful to a considerable element of citizens, whose thorough organization and political activity enables them to control nominations and elections. Accordingly the officials who have to do with enforcement are frequently mere tools of the liquor-saloons; and in an equally large number of cases well-meaning officials are influenced by party considerations, or find it impossible to command effective co-operation from the persons associated with them in the execution of law. To counteract such conditions, the supporters of Prohibitory or restrictive measures have been led to organize Law and Order Leagues, pledged to prosecute the work of enforcement by the use of all available means. Public meetings are held, moral encouragement

---

in such co-operative enterprises as would forever end the strike and lockout as a means of settling disputes in labor circles.

"A single county in Pennsylvania, so I am informed, spent in one year $17,000,000 for drink. That county contains the largest industrial population, comparatively, of any in the State:—$11,000,000 of the $17,000,000 comes from the pockets of workingmen. New York City in one year contributes $15,600,000 to keep men and women in poverty, hunger and cold, while one county in Pennsylvania adds $11,000,000, making a total of $26,600,000."

[1] The *Journal* said, April 11, 1889:

"Pennsylvania, Massachusetts and Nebraska are just now discussing Prohibitory Amendments to their respective Constitutions. Thousands of our members will be called upon to choose between the saloon, with its attendant miseries and vices, and the home with its manifold blessings. Let us hope that the choice will be wisely made. Remember that no Assemby was ever conducted better because its officers or members were privileged to visit the saloon, either before or after the meeting. No strike by a labor organization was ever made successful through the use of intoxicating liquors. No man ever became a better Knight or any Knight a better man by putting into his stomach the stuff which fires the brain and drives the manhood from the man. The reverse of all this has ever been the case, as all history of Labor will go to prove.

"This question is not a political one in any sense. It is a question of morality. The present industrial system encourages drunkenness and vice. They are the legitimate outcome of long hours of hard labor and low wages. In their demoralized and well-nigh helpless condition the wage-workers are scarcely able to help themselves, and we would have this one great curse to the industrial masses, this strong temptation to spend their meagre earnings at the expense even of their manhood, removed as far as possible from them. If the appetite can be controlled in no other way we would make it impossible for them to get the stuff with which to satisfy it.

"When the time comes for the hosts of Labor to speak on this important question, we trust that all will remember that the work of Labor reform can be accomplished quicker and better with clear brains and pure water than with muddled brains and poor whiskey."

is volunteered, money is subscribed by sympathizers, detectives are employed, much evidence of violation is secured, pressure is exercised on the authorities, cases are brought to trial, and results are more or less satisfactory according to the ability, zeal and perseverance of the leaders and the disposition of officials, Courts and juries, the press and the public generally. Law and Order methods were tried, to some extent, in the early days of the Prohibition movement. (See p. 67.) But they did not become widely popular among the temperance people until the Chicago Citizens' League had made its successful attacks on lawless saloon-keepers. This League was founded in 1877. Its object was to prevent the sale of liquor to boys, and "Save the Boys" was adopted as its motto. The number of arrests of minors had reached appalling proportions in Chicago. Through the energetic work of the chief officer of the League, Andrew Paxton, there was an immediate improvement: the number of minors apprehended was diminished, in five years, by several thousands; many liquor-dealers were prosecuted and convicted; public sentiment warmly approved the crusade, and more advanced legislation was enacted at the instance of the League. Mr. Paxton devoted the remainder of his life to this cause, continuing his labors in Chicago and helping to found similar societies in other cities. He was bitterly hated by the rumsellers, and was murderously assaulted a number of times.

Innumerable Law and Order Leagues have sprung into existence since 1877. In nearly every city and town where the conduct of the officials has been objectionable, there has been some attempt to apply the Chicago remedy. In Philadelphia a very useful Law and Order Society has been at work for several years, under the direction of Lewis D. Vail and other prominent men; and when the licensing authority was transferred to the Judges under the Brooks law of Pennsylvania, it was the detailed evidence against saloon-keepers, provided by this Society, which caused the Court to make the sweeping reduction in the number of licenses. Especially deserving of mention, also, are the efforts in behalf of enforcement made from time to time by organizations of private citizens in Brooklyn, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Bangor (Me.) and Sioux City (Ia.). It was in the last-named city that Dr. Haddock was assassinated for venturing to bring to justice the liquor-dealing criminals whom the police authorities had left undisturbed. (See HADDOCK, GEORGE C.) Indeed, Law and Order undertakings have always involved danger of life and limb to those engaged in them.

While a few Leagues have operated successfully for years, nearly all have expired, or become inactive, after brief careers. Even the most faithful and vigorous workers are discouraged by the unbroken successes of the saloon element at the polls, and the apparent hopelessness of waging a costly fight for enforcement against hostile officials. They are also disposed to question the value of achievements which, while leading to conviction and punishment in individual cases, are at best only partial and temporary, and do not seem to really cripple the traffic or to compel the liquor-dealers, as a class, to abide by the law. The good that is accomplished under the impulses of enthusiasm, and of the suddenness and novelty of the movement, cannot withstand for any considerable period of time the reactionary effects of unfavorable legislation and of antagonistic governmental management. Even in Chicago, where circumstances promoted the single aim of the League—to keep the boys out of the saloons,—the arrests of minors increased from 6,550 in 1885 to 8,923 in 1888. Radical persons prefer to devote their best energies to the fight against the drink habit and the license system, and thereby to strike at the root of the evil, rather than to spend them in temporary conflicts for slight advantages.

Nevertheless, Law and Order Leagues have undoubtedly been of much service locally. They have expelled the defiant rum traffic from numerous Prohibition towns and have been instrumental in stimulating public sentiment and putting an end to the pretense that Prohibition cannot be enforced. The uniform opposition which they encounter from all liquor-sellers testifies to their value. While the limitations under which they operate are clearly recognized, they are regarded as allies by all the Prohibition and other temperance organizations.

Since the main purpose of Law and Order work is to procure evidence of undoubted violations—evidence that will be acceptable to the Courts,—the employment of detectives is indispensable. The liquor-dealers, who have no scruples against assassinating, maiming, "slugging" and mobbing their opponents, and who are constantly violating every restrictive provision of liquor and other laws, profess a virtuous detestation for the temperance "spies." Henry H. Faxon, who has had wide experience in all departments of temperance effort, and whose labors in Quincy, Mass. (frequently as a volunteer constable) have exterminated the dram-shops in that city, makes the following comment on the moral bearings of detective service:

> "I trust there is not a person here who is so simple as to believe that licensed liquor-sellers will aid in enforcing the law against unlicensed dealers. They well know that such action would jeopardize their own interests, for the reason that they themselves violate the provisions of their licenses times without number. A man who pays $1,000 for a license to sell whiskey in this enlightened age realizes that in order to succeed financially he must evade many stringent features of the existing law.
>
> "I desire to impress upon my hearers the fact that it is impossible to enforce the law without the aid of detectives. They are a terror to law-breakers, whether of the rumselling or any other fraternity. Liquor-dealers are untiring in their efforts to impress upon the Courts and the people in general the unreliability of 'spotter evidence,' as they are pleased to term it. How truly angelic these men have appeared when they were condemning me for employing parties to purchase liquors, even by the bottle, for the purpose of obtaining evidence whereby I might convict them! No doubt there are dishonest detectives; but, so far as my own experience goes, the greatest rascal among them is more truthful than any rumseller. Criminal lawyers who defend liquor-dealers for a business, will tell a dozen lies where a detective will tell one, and will use their slanderous tongues in insulting every witness who, for the sake of promoting Law and Order, has the courage to take the stand against their clients."[1]

The various societies are represented nationally by the Citizens' Law and Order League of the United States (Charles C. Bonney of Chicago, President, and L. Edwin Dudley of Boston, Secretary), which holds its meetings on Washington's Birthday of each year.

Lawlessness.—The liquor traffic is emphatically a law-defying traffic. Its advocates constantly tell us in regard to any law which opposes its interests, "You cannot enforce it." In other words, the liquor traffic will violate and defy any law which it does not like to obey. This is the claim of the dealers and their friends. It is also their constant practice, as it has been since the foundation of our Government. As early as 1794, the western counties of Pennsylvania, with some adherents from Ohio and Virginia, rose in arms to resist the Excise tax on whiskey of 9 to 25 cents a gallon according to the strength of the liquor. The insurgents burned the house of the Inspector, John Neville, and forced him and the United States Marshal to flee for their lives down the Ohio River in an open boat. They then assembled about 16,000 men in arms, and compelled President Washington to call out the militia to the number of 15,000 against them. It is noteworthy that the very first armed resistance to the authority of the United States was in behalf of whiskey, and that George Washington had to force the liquor traffic to obey the law at the point of the bayonet. It is noticeable, too, that the traffic displayed this spirit before there was any thought of Prohibition—almost a century ago.

The prevalent lawless attitude of the rum power can be most instructively considered from a few striking instances.

In the city of Cincinnati for about 20 years the sale of liquor on Sunday was practically unmolested, State laws to the contrary notwithstanding. The Scott law and afterwards (in 1885) the Dow law made concessions to the Cincinnati rumsellers by authorizing City Councils to permit liquor-selling on Sunday. The City Council of Cincinnati promptly passed a permissive ordinance. But so great was the clamor of temperance men that in 1888 the Owen Sunday law was enacted, completely prohibiting Sunday-selling and making it a criminal offense even to keep open "the place" where liquors were sold on other days. Rev. John Pearson, in *Our Day* for September, 1889, graphically tells what followed. He says:

> "With a great show of virtue Mr. Amor Smith, then Mayor, ordered all arrested who were found violating the law. The Saloon-Keepers' Association decreed that all should keep open, and that all expenses of prosecution

---

[1] From a speech at a meeting of the Citizens' Law and Order League of Massachusetts, May 1, 1889.

should be paid out of their common treasury. In each case a jury was demanded. The Police Court Jury provides that each of the 60 Councilmen shall select 50 names to be put into a wheel, and from it the venire of jurors shall be drawn. Half a dozen of the cleanest men in Council did not furnish their quotas of names, but every saloon-keeper and his helper has supplied his, consequently as high as 48 per cent. of the names on those lists have been found to be saloon-keepers or barroom dependents! The remainder are generally those who it is certain will not convict. Consequently it is next to impossible to secure a conviction. Once last year, when the evidence for the State was as clear as the noon, and the defense offered none, the jury returned a verdict of 'Not Guilty' without leaving their seats! When the Mayor had piled up nearly 2 000 cases in the Police Court he announced that he would make no further attempt to enforce the law, as he was 'satisfied the people do not want it enforced.' The city was under the heel of the saloon. The worst of all was that a veritable pusillanimousness had taken possession of that part of the people that really wanted the law enforced. They would assure you in a hopeless way that they fully agreed the saloons should be closed up, 'but you cannot do anything, and what is the use of trying it? You will either show your weakness or make the rumsellers mad. You had better let things alone.' This was so nearly universal as to threaten paralysis of any effort to throw off the yoke."

Then the Evangelical Ministers' Meeting took up the question. A committee of 500 was formed, which presented at the municipal election of April, 1889, a mixed ticket made up of candidates of all political parties on the simple issue of Sunday-closing, and elected their whole ticket except the Mayor. As the tide of public sentiment rose, the police officers were ordered to arrest all violators. The saloon-keepers then resolved to make "the muckers take their own medicine," and insisted that the Mayor should enforce the Sunday law against "common labor." Accordingly he "promptly issued his proclamation ordering all confectioneries, cigar and tobacco-stores, drug-stores except for medicine, barber-shops, groceries, meat-stores, etc., closed. This fearful stroke of retaliation proved to be in the main exceedingly popular. The barbers, the drug-store proprietors and nearly all the others were well pleased. For two weeks the city had real Sabbaths, showing above everything else that what nearly all pronounced impossible can be done—viz., the law can be enforced."

In this is strikingly noticeable the difference between the liquor traffic and all other businesses. The saloon-keepers themselves procured an object-lesson to show they had stood alone in defiance of a law to which all other tradesmen quietly yielded. Threatening letters with skull and cross-bones were sent to persons prominent in promoting enforcement.

"On Sunday, July 20, 1889, was reached the period of bloodshed. A member of the Law and Order League was set upon and brutally beaten—rescued only at the muzzle of a policeman's revolver, while that policeman himself was stunned with a blow from a loaded cane. At another time in the same beer-hall a quiet citizen, because he called for lemonade, was seized and beaten on suspicion that he was a Law and Order spy. Later in the evening, in the same den, after its proprietor had been arrested and released on a $10,000 bond, another policeman going to arrest a bartender was also brutally assaulted, while the most villainous outcries rent the air. A meeting of saloon-keepers was held in Turner Hall on the ensuing Thursday afternoon, attended by five or six hundred, who adopted the following resolutions

"'*Whereas*, The well-known Owen law, through which corruption and hypocrisy can sneak in everywhere, threatens to become established in Cincinnati; and,

"'*Whereas*, No concerted action has been taken to resent the said law, which is an insult to common sense; therefore, be it

"'RESOLVED, That we, the saloon keepers here assembled, openly oppose this law, which is unpopular and damaging to our business; and therefore we have decided to keep our places of business quietly open on next Sunday, and on all succeeding Sundays, conducting our business as on any other day, and avoiding all disturbances.

"'RESOLVED, That we condemn the side and back-door business as corrupting in its tendency, and we will make it our special duty to oppose it by all legal means.

"'RESOLVED, That each saloon-keeper who signs the resolutions of this meeting shall have our solid protection in every case of prosecution, and the expenses thereof shall be defrayed by our own means.'"

About 300 saloon-keepers pledged themselves in writing to keep open on the following Sunday. It is safe to say that no such compact was ever formed by the devotees of any other business in the United States. The result of that conspiracy of defiance is told as follows:

"We are glad to report that Mayor Mosby took his stand for law and order, and Col. Deitsch manifested his ability to handle the lawless element, and it is due to the police force of this city to say that they did their duty fearlessly and promptly, with one exception, who was suspended on the spot by Lieutenant Scahill. Several officers were injured in making arrests, but every man was landed in the station-house, although many fights occurred and two incipient riots were quelled by the timely arrival of help. After one of these, an immense crowd, who did not appreciate the manner in which they had been handled by the police, assembled at the Bremen Station, the ringleaders urging the crowd to assault the station-house. Suddenly the doors flew open and a large body of police, under Captain Hadley and Lieutenants Rakel and Langdon, filed out and quickly formed and drove the mob from the street. At the Oliver Street Station the officers found it necessary to play upon the crowd with the fire-hose to clear the street. The Police Board has stood nobly by the law. When on the late occasion of the Turnfest the Chief of Police issued, by command of the Mayor, an order not to arrest violators of the law, the Police Commissioners, on complaint of a Law and Order man, tried the Chief for malfeasance and misfeasance in office and found him guilty. Last week they revoked the appointment of the private policeman in the notorious beer-garden alluded to above, and ordered the most determined prosecution of the assailants."

Many have supposed that the persistent violation of law by the liquor traffic is due to the excessive severity of Prohibition, which, they affirm, "public sentiment does not sustain." These persons declare that High License is better than Prohibition "because it can be enforced, while Prohibition cannot." But the fact is that the restrictive provisions of High License laws are not enforced. The following statements were given by the Agent of the Law and Order League of Pittsburgh in the *Voice* of Jan. 16, 1890:

"There are just 92 licensed saloons in Pittsburgh, paying the $500 fee under the Brooks High License law, but it is not an easy matter to give the exact number of 'speak-easies' or unlicensed saloons in operation. The police authorities of the city claim that they have a list of over 700 'speak easies' with the locations and testimony to convict, but, dog-in-the-manger like, they will neither prosecute themselves nor furnish the information to any one who will. These 'speak-easies' flourish under the guise of 'boarding' 'rooms to let,' grocery stores, and in cellars, garrets and stables, and are run very secretly. We are in a most deplorable state. Our county detective announces annually or oftener that he is just getting ready to wipe out the 'speak-easies.' but we never hear of any results. Our police are the creatures of a ring whose political power is perpetuated by the liquor element, and, as a consequence, when it does strike a blow at the unlicensed liquor-dealer it is generally directed against a man who has no political pull, or a poor woman."

The Pawtucket (R. I.) *Gazette and Chronicle*, a strong Republican daily paper, for Oct. 18, 1889, said:

"The citizens of Rhode Island cannot have forgotten the rather profuse assurances that were given them only a few months ago, that when the demon of Prohibition should have been exorcised from the body politic, once more would the State of Rhode Island rejoice in a government by law. Nor will they readily forget with what unction the advocates of a repeal of Prohibition deplored the demoralizing influences of a law that was at variance with public opinion and, therefore, incapable of enforcement, thereby destroying popular respect for all law. If we mistake not, the proposed conditions of righteousness have been fulfilled, and law has been made in entire harmony with that class of public opinion represented in the demand for repeal of Prohibition. Who says that law is either enforced or respected to-day in either Pawtucket or Providence? Is liquor being sold only according to law in either city? How many law-breaking liquor-sellers have been arrested? There are laws and ordinances against drunkenness, and it is the sworn duty of officials to enforce these laws and ordinances. Is one drunken man arrested out of every ten that reel by our policemen? Will somebody tell us the conditions under which law may be permitted to be enforced? Or is it best to annul all law?"

Similar testimonies come from Chicago, St. Louis, Kansas City and Omaha. Nowhere are the restrictive provisions of High License laws obeyed. We have laws against selling liquor on Sunday, yet there is no day in the week when there are so many men intoxicated; laws against selling to minors, yet boys are continually made drunk, and many before they are 21 become confirmed drunkards; laws against selling to men in the habit of getting intoxicated, yet the habitual drunkard is constantly made drunk again; laws against selling within the neighborhood of an agricultural fair, yet the saloons do a most profitable business in fair time. The saloon-keepers, as a class, are known to be law-breaking and law-defying. Nor is this statement to be limited to the retail dealers. In 1874–6 the rich distillers of this country proved themselves defrauders of the revenue on a gigantic scale; and to-day the United States Government keeps its agents in every brewery and distillery to watch the whole process of production as a cat watches a mouse. Criminality sticks to every step of the inhuman traffic. The effect of the business upon the general administration of criminal law has been most pernicious. The shifts and evasions adopted to clear the saloon-keeper have been found ample to clear other criminals. Whenever we take pains to inquire whence his crimes originated, we trace the Anarchist straight back to the saloon. The Cleveland *Leader* says:

"The saloon played a very disreputable rôle in the Chicago riots. Reports say that 'the men who had money spent it in getting drinks for themselves and friends, and soon they were fighting drunk.' The Anarchists went forth from saloons to make their incendiary harangues and they slunk away into saloons when charged on by the police. August Spies and Michael Schwab were arrested in a room over a saloon where they print their Anarchist paper, and in the same room were found the forms of type from which incendiary hand-bills were printed.

"The Milwaukee riots were also fomented by Anarchists, who were aided in no slight degree by the saloons. Large numbers of the rioters were striking employees of breweries; and the objective point of the mob at each of its wild demonstrations was either a brewery or one of the immense beer-gardens of the city."

It is the same in New York. The chief Anarchist, Herr Most, was arrested in a saloon, and the moment he obtained bail was "dodging in and out of saloons all day," meeting and attempting to reorganize his followers.

The early advocates of High License supposed—and the supposition seemed a reasonable one—that the licensed saloon-keepers would be practically a police force to carry out the law against any dealers who might sell without license. But that hope utterly failed. The explanation is, that the licensed saloon-keepers, by Sunday-selling, selling to minors and inebriates, etc., are themselves violators of law, and dare not invoke the law against unlicensed dealers, on the principle that "those who live in glass houses should not throw stones."

These are remarkable facts. From the foundation of the Government to the present time the liquor traffic stands out as the great law-defying "industry," not against Prohibition, but against any laws which restrict its profits or privileges. The first and most natural resort of the liquor traffic is deliberate violation of law carried to any extent of defiance or violence. If there were no other reason for Prohibition this would be enough, that it is not safe to tolerate within our civilization a business which holds itself so haughtily, composed of 500,000 men closely organized, wielding untold millions of capital, manipulating all the vilest elements of the populace, setting aside at its pleasure the laws of State or nation, and exhibiting to all the dangerous classes of the community one great example of defiant, triumphant and prosperous lawlessness. To allow this is to legalize anarchy.

The law-defying traffic can be suppressed. While the liquor traffic differs from all other lines of business in a settled disposition to evade and defy the law, it does not differ from others in the necessity of submission to law in the hands of resolute officials. This has been found true from Washington's day to our own. The Whiskey Insurrection was suppressed, the distillers conceding the Government's right of taxation, which they have never since challenged, although the Government tax is now more than four times the original cost of the product.

The attempt was at one time made to resist by force the execution of the Maine law. Gen. Neal Dow, then Mayor of Portland, tells the story as follows:

"The rum press had for many days been firing up the brains of the advocates of 'personal liberty' by ferocious denunciations of the Maine law, which undertook to prescribe 'what men should or should not eat and drink.' The wrath of these people culminated when the Board of Aldermen, in preparation for an 'Agency' for the sale of liquors according to law, for medicinal and mechanical purposes and the arts, ordered a quantity of them from New York, which were deposited in the cellar of the old City Hall where the Agency was to be located. The cry among the personal liberty men was, 'If we can't sell liquor nobody shall!' So they assembled at night in great numbers, with the purpose of destroying the Agency liquors and burning the City Hall and also the residences of obnoxious temperance men. The city authorities had but brief notice of the intended outbreak; consequently it required some time to summon the military to the spot. The police force did its best, in the meantime, to make head against the howling mob. There had been many mobs in Portland in the old rum times, no one of which had ever been successfully resisted, or any member of it punished. So these misguided patriots supposed that they also could accomplish their purpose, which was to break down the Maine law. Some of the most prominent men in Portland were behind this mob, instigating it to violence and outrage. The Mayor, after long and vainly waiting for the fury of the mob to subside, assured them that he would fire upon them, but they did not believe it. Twice he ordered the military to fire, and twice, at the aim, he ordered 'Recover arms.' This seemed to justify the notion of the mob that there would be no firing. The third time there was no order to recover arms, and the rattle of the musketry was fearful. The military, not being accustomed to such work, fired just over the heads of the mob, so that only one man was killed and a few were wounded—it was never known how many, because the instigators of the tumult feared to be known as being mixed up in it. It was impossible to foresee what might have been the result if this savage mob, fired with strong drink, had succeeded in breaking down municipal authority, thus leaving the city at its mercy. The mob was summarily suppressed, and the mob spirit in Portland was completely crushed out. This manner of dealing with the rebellion was unanimously approved by all the better part of the people."

In every instance of decided conflict the liquor traffic has yielded to official determination. The conclusion is inevitable that any law needed to protect the people against this desolating traffic can be enforced, if honest and efficient executive officers are elected by the people.

J. C. FERNALD.

Legal Suasion is a term which properly designates the permanent influence of penal law upon the morals of society. It is really a phase of moral suasion, but the latter term has been limited to a class of moral efforts to lessen evil without the assistance of force. Hence arises the necessary use of this new and distinctive expression—Legal Suasion. To abate a bawdy-house by the voluntary consent of its inmates is moral suasion; to abate it by police force as a nuisance is legal suasion, provided the result be permanent moral improvement.

All jurists agree that the ulterior object of criminal law is not the punishment of the offender but the prevention of the offense. The prevailing motive of crime being that of gain, the punishment is inflicted to make the offense unprofitable. Freed from self-interest, the human mind is better able to judge between right and wrong and thus the law tends to a permanent moral result.

Again, the standard of right with many people is good citizenship, and a general tendency exists to obey law simply because it is law. Morals are thus affected through the operation of what may be termed an artificial conscience. In the early history of this country, for instance, lotteries were a popular and legal method of raising funds for the founding of colleges and hospitals and the building of roads and bridges. At the present day it would be difficult to find any considerable number of people, outside of Louisiana and Kentucky, favorable to the existence of the lottery system. This change of sentiment is not due to the fact that the inhabitants of the excepted States are naturally less moral than their neighbors, but to the educative effect of prohibitive laws and Constitutional provisions in the States where the sentiment against lotteries prevails.

Another instance of legal suasion is found in the abhorrence with which human slavery is now regarded; yet formerly so strong was the moral influence of the Christian church in its favor that in 1859 a Church Anti-Slavery Society was instituted "for the purpose of convincing American churches and ministers that slavery was a sin and inducing them to take the lead in the work of its abolition." Such a changed tone of opinion in this short period can logically be accounted for on no other basis than that of the Emancipation Proclamation and the succeeding 13th and 14th Amendments to the United States Constitution.

There can be no doubt that a similar moral effect is produced by laws prohibiting the liquor traffic. It is hardly conceivable that the State of Maine in the year 1884 would have put Prohibition into her Constitution by a majority vote of three to one, unless for 30 years the people of that State had experienced the practical advantages of Prohibitory legislation.

It is true that unless careful discrimination be exercised in each case, there is great danger of misconceiving the precise educative effect of law. For a law may be so loosely drawn and the attempt at its enforcement so farcical as to impede the real moral working of the law itself. To this difficulty, doubtless, is due the sudden revulsion of opinion which occasionally occurs where a small but energetic body of corrupt politicians bends its energies to cast a well-intentioned law into disrepute.

COLERIDGE A. HART.

Legislation.—It is one of the most interesting facts in history that in all English-speaking nations, colonies and States the regulation of the sale of liquor has occupied the attention of Parliaments and legislative assemblies almost from the beginning, and that this is true of none of the other countries of Christendom. One of the things contended for by the framers of the Magna Charta, and conceded by that instrument, was the right to have it decreed that all measures for wine and ale should be of uniform size. Soon followed a period in which the prices of these beverages were as carefully watched and adjusted as those of bread, for in those days it was within the sphere of practical political economy for the Legislature to fix the prices of labor and its products, leaving nothing but agricultural products to competition, or supply and demand. During the first two or three centuries after Magna Charta, the efforts toward restricting the traffic in the liquors then in vogue (ale and wine) were only partial and tentative. Indeed, the Judges gravely decided that at common law it was lawful for any one to keep an alehouse (the King v. Joyes, 2 Show., 468), unless it were kept in a disorderly manner (Stevens v. Watson, 1 Salk., 45). By the act of 11 Henry VII, c. 2 (1494), any two Justices were given power to suppress unnecessary alehouses.

But the first license law was that of 5 & 6 Edward VI, c. 25 (1551–2). It required that none should keep alehouses who were not authorized to do so by the Sessions of the Peace or two Justices, and those permitted or licensed were to give bond for good order and were not to allow unlawful gaming. Any person selling without license was to be fined 20 shillings. The act of 7 Edward VI, c. 5 (1553–4) regulated wines separately, providing that none should sell wines excepting in cities and market towns, and then only in restricted numbers and under licenses issued by the Mayors and Sessions respectively; the penalty for unlawful selling was £5. The famous Tippling acts of James I (1 James I, c. 9 [1603–4]) applied to both ale and wine-selling and fined each seller 10 shillings for allowing townsmen to tipple; while chapter 5 of 4 James I (1606–7) provided that drunkenness should be punished by a fine of five shillings or confinement for six hours in the stocks. Another law passed in the reign of the same king (7 James I, c. 10 [1609–10]) provided that any alehouse-keeper convicted of violating the law should be disqualified for three years from keeping such a house. The last restrictive act of this series was the one passed in 1627 under Charles I (3 Charles I, c. 4), by which was established an alternative penalty of whipping for the first offense of illegal selling, and for the second offense imprisonment for one month.

The vending of spirits was first regulated in 1700 (12 and 13 William III, c. 11), a Justice's license being required before anybody was entitled to sell. But distillers were permitted to retail without license provided they did not tolerate tippling in their houses.

English legislation includes no more celebrated acts than those designed to restrain the promiscuous sale of geneva or gin, passed in the reign of George II. Soon after the beginning of the 18th Century the evils resulting from the use of distilled spirits in England became in the highest degree alarming. Lecky, in his "England in the 18th Century" (vol. 1, p. 519), speaking of the universal demand for gin at that time, says:

> "Small as is the place which this fact occupies in English history, it was probably, if we consider all the consequences that have flowed from it, the most momentous in that of the 18th Century—incomparably more so than any event in the purely political or military annals of the country."

Among the most famous cartoons of the great Hogarth, portraying the manners, vices and follies of that age, are those that picture the evils of intemperance, particularly mentionable being his shocking "Gin Lane." The eminent writers of that period have left vivid descriptions of the inordinate drinking and the wretchedness occasioned by it. The following is a striking passage from Smollet's "History of England" (vol. 3, chap. 7):

> "The populace of London were sunk into the most brutal degeneracy by drinking to excess the pernicious spirit called gin, which was sold so cheap that the lowest class of the people could afford to indulge themselves in one continued state of intoxication, to the destruction of all morals, industry and order. Such a shameful degree of profligacy prevailed that the retailers of this poisonous compound set up painted boards in public inviting people to be drunk for the small expense of one penny, assuring them they might be dead drunk for two pence, and have straw for nothing. They accordingly provided cellars and places strewed with straw, to which they conveyed those wretches who were overwhelmed with intoxication. In these dismal caverns they lay until they recovered some use of their faculties, and then they had recourse to the same mischievous potion; thus consuming their health and ruining their families in hideous receptacles of the most filthy vice, resounding with riot, execration and blasphemy. Such beastly practices too plainly denoted a total want of all police and civil regulations, and would have reflected disgrace upon the most barbarous community."

The first of the Gin laws was that enacted in 1729 (2 George II, c. 17), and imposed a license fee of £20 on every seller of geneva. It was repealed in 1733 by the act of 6 George II, c. 17, not having served the purpose of checking gin-drinking. In 1736 (9 George II, c. 23) a more stringent measure was adopted, as follows:

> "*Whereas*, The excessive drinking of spirituous liquors by the common people tends not only to the destruction of their health and the debauching of their morals but to the public ruin; for remedy therof.
>
> "Be it enacted, that from Dec. 29 no person shall presume, by themselves or any others employed by them, to sell or retail any brandy, rum, arrack, usquebaugh, geneva, aqua vitæ, or any other distilled spirituous liquors, mixed or unmixed, in any less quantity than two gallons, without first taking out a license for that purpose within ten days at least before they sell or retail the same; for which they shall pay down £50, to be renewed ten days before the year expires, paying the like sum, and in case of neglect to forfeit £100; such licenses to be taken out within the limits of the penny-post at the chief office of Excise, London, and at the next office of Excise for the country. And be it enacted that, for all such spirituous liquors as any retailers shall be possessed of on or after Sept. 29, 1736, there shall be paid a duty of 20*s* per gallon, and so in proportion for a greater or lesser quantity, above all other duties charged on the same."

This measure was strengthened by 10 George II, c. 17, § 9, which provided that hawkers of liquor not able to pay their fines should be whipped; and prosecutions were facilitated by another law passed in 1738 (11 George II, c. 26). The act of 1735 endured for only eight years, meanwhile giving rise to much discussion of the principles lying at the foundation of restrictive liquor legislation. The elegant Lord Chesterfield's ever-memorable plea for Prohibition of vice as opposed to regulation, belongs to this era. (See p. .)

The Excise duties, which had been increasing in volume, were now a distinctive feature of the Government revenue. After the repeal of the special taxes on spirituous liquors in 1743, the Excise duties steadily became more and more important from the revenue point of view, and were relied on to provide a large part of the money needed in the wars upon which England embarked. Spirit-sellers were still required, however, to take out magisterial licenses, as ale and wine-sellers had always been compelled to do and are now. The repealing act of 1743 and the acts of 1751 and 1783 consolidated all licenses on the basis of alehouse licenses.

In the present century the tendency has been towards an increase in the Excise rates, although the Beer act of 1830 (discriminating in favor of beer, supposedly in the interest of temperance) marks a departure quite as interesting as that instituted by the Gin acts of a hundred years previously. (See LIGHT LIQUORS.) In the last decade there have been some indications of a disposition to give a more radical turn to legislation and grant Local Option, and there seems to be a growing realization that the future policy of England in reference to the drink traffic will be gradually adapted to the demands of temperance agitators. This tendency is shown by the two crushing defeats of the liquor-sellers' efforts for compensation in the event of the extinguishment of licenses, and in frequent significant utterances from British statesmen, notably the very recent remark by Mr. Gladstone that it would be wrong to do anything that would "throw back the cause whose progress we have observed and registered from day to day, and in the great future triumph of which we have undoubting confidence." (See pp. 95–6.)

In the English colonies in America, the question of license was more or less prominent from the first, as will be seen by reference to the dates of the early laws enumerated under the names of States that were formerly colonies. These colonial acts were expressed in strong language, copied from the English statutes mostly; but nothing beside regulation by license was attempted (although there were fugitive discriminations against distilled spirits, and the sale of liquor to Indians was prohibited in a number of cases). License fees and penalties for violations were low. It was attempted to confine liquor-selling to those who kept hotels and taverns and actually accommodated the public.

Until 1830 there was no perceptible change in the character of the enactments; but before the end of the decade beginning with that year, Ohio, Tennessee and Mississippi had passed laws prohibiting the retail selling of liquors by refusing license therefor. In both Mississippi and Tennessee these measures were very short-lived.

Maine enacted a law prohibiting the sale of liquor in 1846, and in 1851 the Maine law prohibiting both manufacture and sale was adopted. It was followed in the same decade by similar laws (nearly all of them short-lived) in many States.

The development of Southern Local Option had begun before the war. During that cataclysm distillation was prohibited in most of the States of the Confederacy as a war measure. After peace was restored the Local Option movement advanced rapidly until this policy covered most of that section and was embodied in the Constitutions of Texas and Florida.

Constitutional Prohibition and High License are both of very recent origin, and the regulations peculiar to these systems may be best studied by examining the digests of laws in the States where they prevail.

Each new general act relating to the drink traffic is more extended than former ones; and in many cases anything like a complete analysis of State laws consecutively is almost out of the question. In the ensuing digests, the acts of the several States and Territories are brought down to the begining of 1890. Only actual legislation is considered: it is impossible to notice the numerous bills (although some of them are highly interesting) that have been introduced in State Legislatures from time to time but have failed to pass or have been vetoed.

The subject of Federal legislation on the liquor question deserves special treatment, and is therefore not touched upon in this article, except in the cases of Territories for which separate liquor regulations have been provided by Federal authority. (For general Federal Legislation, see UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.)

Since the liquor laws of the Dominion of Canada closely resemble those of many of the States, they may profitably be considered in this connection. But having been summarized in the article on CANADA, they are not repeated here.

The manuscript of the whole of this article goes to the printer before the session laws of 1890 are obtainable. Therefore the law as it existed in 1889 is given as the latest law in each case, excepting North Dakota.

DIGESTS OF STATE LAWS.

Alabama.

Earliest Provisions.—The act of Mississippi Territory, of March 4, 1803, revised in 1807, provided that every person who should be recommended for the purpose, to the County Court, by six reputable freeholders of the county, might be licensed to keep a tavern on payment of $20. He was to provide tavern accommodations to travelers, and not suffer gaming. Anyone presuming to keep a tippling-house or sell liquor without a license forfeited $10, and for subsequent offenses $20. But merchants and shopkeepers were not prevented from retailing liquors, in any quantity above a quart, not to be drunk on the premises. Selling to or entertaining any servant, apprentice or slave without permission of the master; selling to soldiers and to Indians, and selling adulterated liquor, were fined as above. (Toul. Dig., 1823, p. 727.) Tavern-keepers getting drunk forfeited their licenses. Any one else getting drunk was by an act of 1803 fined $1. (Id., p. 218.) An act in 1809 required a licensee to take oath not to sell to a slave without written consent of his master. (Id., p. 730.) License fees were, in 1814, reduced to $10. The same year owners of distilleries were authorized to sell their product in quantities of not less than a quart. (Id., p. 732.) About 20 years later the license fee was again made $20, and the freeholders were required to live within five miles of the petitioner for license. (Laws, 1837, No. 47.)

Other Provisions Before the War.—The revenue act taxed licenses to retail spirituous or fermented liquors $30. (Laws, 1842, No. 1, § 7.) The law relating to tavern licenses was to be construed to apply to cities, towns, or villages only. (Laws, 1845, No. 10.) License for retailing spirits in cities was placed at $100; in towns or villages having 500 inhabitants or more, $50; having less, $30, and in the country, $30. (Laws, 1847, No. 1, § 98.) Retailers were not allowed to retail in more than one building or place under the same license. (Id., § 99.) License in cities was changed to $75; on water-craft, $60; in towns or villages having over 500 inhabitants, $37.50; having less, $25; in the country, $15. (Laws, 1849 No. 1, p. 8.) Judges of Probate might at regular term grant licenses to retail the same as County Courts then did. (Laws, 1849, No. 3, § 10.)

License for sales of liquor, on water-craft, was required to be in the name of the captain, and to be hung up in a conspicuous place in the bar-room. (Laws 1857, No. 273.) Delivering liquor to slaves on boats rendered the captain liable to indictment and fine of from $50 to $100. (Id., No. 275, § 1.) And a charge that such captain permitted delivery to a slave shall be sufficient, and proof that any person of color, not connected with the vessel, obtained liquor of any person connected therewith, or was seen coming off said boat with liquor, was *prima facie* evidence of the guilt of the accused, without proving the name of the slave or that he was a slave. (Id., § 2.)

Adulteration, by manufacturers of spirits, with poisonous or unwholesome substances, was prohibited in 1857, on penalty of not over $500, or imprisonment one year. (Laws, No. 274.) Four local acts prohibiting sales of liquor within certain distances of schools and churches were also passed in 1857. Many prohibitions or Prohibitory powers had previously been incorporated in charters. By the act of 1859, No. 79, the penalty against adulteration was made from $200 to $500, with imprisonment for one year, in the cases of manufacturers and vendors.

The War Period.—Local Prohibitory laws continued to be passed, 16 being passed in 1861, while several former ones were repealed. By act No. 25, of 1861, sales to free negroes were prohibited, on penalty of not less than $500; and sales to slaves were punished by fine of $200 to $500, or imprisonment from one to five years. As a war measure, distillation of grain was forbidden, in 1862, except under direction of the Governor, under heavy penalties. In 1863, six acts extended such provisions to peas, potatoes, molasses and sugar, and increased the stringency of the regulations. No. 128 of the acts of 1864 repealed the above laws, authorized such distillation, but forbade the distillation of corn and wheat under penalty of $5,000 to $50,000, or imprisonment from one to 12 months, or both. The same acts authorized granting licenses to distillers of cane or molasses or fruit, for a fee of $100 per 40-gallon still. Liquor so distilled from cane was taxed $10 a gallon, and that from fruit $5 a gallon. The penalty for distilling without license was from $5,000 to $50,000, for the first offense, with a discretionary imprisonment of one to three years. This law was repealed in 1866.

After the War.—A few local prohibitions were passed in 1866 and thereafter, 17 such being passed in 1870. Act No. 3, Laws, 1871, exempted distillers of fruits, cane and grapes from all tax. In 1872 were passed 32 prohibitions to sell within certain distances from towns, churches, schools, factories, etc. Forty-one local prohibitions were made in 1873, and 70 in 1874, the radii of such protected districts being from one to six miles. Such enactments have continued to be very numerous, with only a small proportion of repeals to the present time (1890). They are the peculiar feature of Alabama legislation upon this subject.

The tax on licenses was somewhat reduced by the Revenue law of 1874. In this State, the provisions for taxes on liquor licenses have always been coupled with those on all other kinds of business, and the amounts charged apparently according to the exigencies of the revenue. The ordinary regulative provisions as to obtaining licenses, with the conduct required and the penalties attached, have also applied to other kinds of license, and have been repeated, with slight variations, in each of the revenue laws which are almost annually passed. In 1875 (Laws, No. 120), it was provided that no license should be granted without the recommendation of ten freeholders, and oath not to sell illegally.

No. 204 of Laws, 1874, is a regular Local Option law, authorizing the Probate Judges of 17 counties, upon the petition of any freeholder within the proposed limits, to submit to vote therein the question of the Prohibition of the sale of liquor, within certain distances of any place, in any of said counties.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—It shall be the duty of the General Assembly to pass adequate laws giving protection against the evils arising from the use of intoxicating liquors at all elections. (Const., Art 8, § 6.) Selling or giving any liquors, during the day of any election, or on the day preceding, is unlawful, and it is the duty of any Sheriff or Constable to arrest all persons violating this section. (Code, 1887, § 380.) License fees are required of persons engaging in the business of the retail of spirituous, vinous or malt liquor on any water-craft, or on any sleeping, dining or buffet car, to the amount of $250; and the State has a preferred lien on such craft or cars for the same. Retail of such liquors in any place of less than 1,000 inhabitants, $125;
places of 1,000 to 3,000, $175;
places of 3,000 to 10,000, $250;
places of more than 10,000, $300;
dealers in lager-beer, exclusively, one-fourth above rates. (Code, 1887, § 629.)

The wholesale license fee is $200. Any dealer selling only one quart or more is a wholesale dealer; and if he sells liquors, or permits them to be taken, in less quantity, or permits the same to be drunk by the glass or single drink in or about his premises, he shall be deemed a retail dealer. Compounders and rectifiers pay $200. Distillers of spirituous liquors pay $200, but this does not apply to distillers of fruits. Brewers pay $15. The County Commissioners may add to such taxes not exceeding 50 per cent. for county purposes. (Id., § 630.)

On the last day of March, and every three months thereafter, the Judge shall forward to the Auditor lists of all licenses, and pay to the State and County Treasurers the amounts received therefor, minus 2½ per cent. for his commission. If such Judge fails herein, he shall be impeached. (Id., § 633.) All licenses shall be kept posted up in plain sight near the bar, on pain of forfeiture of license. (Id., § 636.)

A license to retail must not be granted by the Probate Judge until the applicant produce a recommendation signed by 20 respectable householders and freeholders, residing in the town, city or precinct of the business, stating that they are acquainted with him, that he is of good moral character, and a proper person to be licensed. If there are not so many such householders and freeholders in such district, a majority of the whole number therein is sufficient. (Id., § 1319.)

Every applicant for license must take and file an oath not to sell to minors or persons of unsound mind, without permission of guardian or parent, or to any person of known intemperate habits, or keep open on Sunday, or violate the statute prohibiting sales of agricultural products between sunset and sunrise, or permit the same in or about the premises, or allow any gaming thereon. (Id., § 1320.)

All sales or exchanges of liquor, or contracts for the same, by persons not licensed as above, or by licensed persons to or with minors or persons of unsound mind, without consent of parent or guardian, or a person of known intemperate habits without a physician's requisition, are void. (Id., § 1523.)

Persons selling or giving liquors to a minor, without consent of his parent or guardian, unless upon physician's prescription, or to a person of known intemperate habits, unless upon such prescription, shall be fined $50 to $500. Any minor obtaining such liquor by means of false representation as to his age must be fined not more than $50. (Id., § 4058.)

Persons selling within one mile of any place of religious worship, not in an incorporated town, on any day of public preaching, shall be fined $20 to $50 or punished by imprisonment or both. (Id., § 4040.) Any person who conceals himself in any place and disposes of intoxicating liquor in evasion of law, must be fined $250 to $1,000, and may be imprisoned not more than one year. (Id., § 4041.)

And any owner or proprietor of any place, permitting such evasion knowingly, shall be fined $50 to $1,000, and may be imprisoned not more than one year. (Id., § 4042.)

Any person who, while intoxicated or drunk, appears in any public place where one or more persons are present, or at any private residence not his own, and manifests a drunken condition by boisterous or indecent conduct or loud and profane discourse, shall be fined $5 to $100. (Laws, 1888, No. 10.)

There is a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. (R. S., 1888, § 934; passed in 1887.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by two-thirds of all the members of each House at one session; popular vote to be taken at the next general election for Representatives, three months' notice to be given. A majority carries it.

Alaska Territory.

May 4, 1887, the following executive order was issued by President Cleveland, through C. S. Fairchild, Secretary of the Treasury:

"The following regulations are prescribed under the authority of Section 14 of the act of May 17, 1884, entitled 'An Act providing a civil government for Alaska,' and Section 1955 of the Revised Statutes:

"1. No intoxicating liquors shall be landed at any port or place in the Territory of Alaska without a permit from the chief officer of the customs at such port or place, to be issued upon evidence satisfactory to such officer that the liquors are imported and are to be used solely for sacramental, medicinal, mechanical or scientific purposes.

"2. The importation into said Territory of breech-loading rifles and suitable ammunition therefor, except for the personal use of white settlers or temporary visitors not traders, is hereby prohibited.

"3. The master of any vessel departing from any port in the United States having on board intoxicating liquors or breech-loading rifles and ammunition suitable therefor, when such vessel is destined to any place in said Territory, or if not so destined, when the intended course lies within the waters of the Territory, will be required to file with the Collector of Customs at the port of departure a special manifest, signed and verified in duplicate, of all such liquors, arms, and ammunition; and no clearance shall be granted to any such vessel unless the articles embraced in the special manifest are shown to the satisfaction of the Collector to belong to the necessary supplies and equipment of the vessel, or to be entitled to the above specified exemptions, or are covered by bonds taken under the provisions of said Section 1955.

"4. One of the special manifests above provided for will be delivered to the master, together with the clearance, if granted, and any intoxicating liquors, breech-loading rifles and ammunition found on board a vessel within the waters of the Territory without such special manifest will be seized and the offenders prosecuted under the provisions of Section 1,957 of the Revised Statutes."

This is still in force.

Arizona Territory.

Early Provisions.—Howell's Code, authorized by the first act of the first Legislature of the Territory, provided (c. 49, §§ 3 and 4) that all tavern or inn-keepers, all keepers of restaurants or saloons, and all other persons selling or disposing of spirituous or malt liquors, in quantities of less than a quart, should pay a license tax of $30 per quarter; eating-houses selling only malt liquors, $10 per quarter, and peddlers selling liquors, $10 per month. In 1871 those whose sales amounted to more than $5,000 per quarter were taxed $20 per quarter, others $8. (Laws, 1871, p. 126.) Selling or giving intoxicating liquors to Indians was prohibited under a penalty of $100 to $300, or imprisonment from one to six months, or both. (Laws, 1873, p. 78, § 1.) One-half said fine recovered was to go to the informants. (Id., § 3.)

Notes or accounts for liquor, by the drink or bottle, were not collectable where they amounted to over $5. (Laws, 1875, p. 42.) This was repealed the next session. (Laws, 1877, No. 5.) All station-keepers upon the public highways who sold liquor were taxed $10 per quarter. (Laws 1877, No. 43.)

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—The County Treasurer shall prepare suitable blank licenses and deliver to the Sheriff on his receipt therefor, and he shall issue the same on payment of the license tax. (R. S., 1887, §§ 2232, 2233.) Persons doing business without license shall be liable to a fine of not less than the amount of the delinquent tax, nor more than $300, or imprisonment in default of payment. (Id., § 2236.) All persons selling or disposing of wines, distilled or malt liquors in quantities of two gallons and upward, shall pay, on quarterly sales of $25,000 and upward, $125 per quarter, on sales of $25,000 to $15,000, $100; on sales of $15,000 or less, $70. Dealers in quantities from one quart to two gallons shall pay $30 per quarter, and retailers of one quart or less, $50 per quarter in addition to any tax for any other business in the same place. Persons at a wayside inn or station, not within four miles of any city, town or village, shall pay $10 per quarter. (Id., § 2239.) Distilleries and breweries pay $10 to $40 per quarter, according to the volume of their business. No license exempts the property used in the business from tax under the general revenue laws. (Id., § 2240.) No license shall be required of any physician or apothecary for any liquors they may use in the preparation of medicines. Licenses are not transferable, but in the case of the death of any licensee, his widow, executor or administrator may continue the business until the expiration of the term. (Id., § 2243.) Minors under the age of 16, unless accompanied by their parents or guardians, shall not be allowed in any saloon under penalty of $10 to $200 or imprisonment five to 50 days, or both. (Pen. Code, 1887, § 513.) No person shall knowingly sell or give liquor to any minor under 16 without consent of parent or guardian, under penalty of $5 to $100, or imprisonment 20 to 90 days, or both. (Id., § 514.) Every person furnishing intoxicating liquor to an Indian or common drunkard is guilty of a misdemeanor. (Id., § 635.) Every person who adulterates or dilutes any spirituous or malt liquor or wine with fraudulent intent to cause or permit it to be offered for sale, or fraudulently sells or offers the same for sale, is guilty of a misdemeanor. (Id., § 606.)

Arkansas.

Early Provisions.—To prevent disorders and mischief which might result from a multiplicity of public-houses, no persons were allowed to keep such without license by the County Court, upon penalty of $10. Disorder incurred a penalty of $2 and revocation of license. The sum to be paid for license was fixed at $10 to $30. No persons were to sell to slaves and soldiers without license obtained of master or of officer, respectively. (C. L., 1855, p. 541.) By R. S., 1838 c. 148, such license tax was made $10 to $100, and violations of the act were punished by fine of not exceeding $50. By the act of 1854, p. 125, a person applying for license to retail vinous or ardent spirits must produce a petition therefor, signed by a majority of the resident voters of the township; whereupon it was the duty of the County Court to grant the license. Every separate sale contrary to the act was declared a distinct offense. By act of 1854 p. 148, no license was allowed to be granted in Phillips County and Taylor Township, in Columbia County. Disposing of liquors to Indians was made a misdemeanor and fined from $1 to $500. (Laws, 1856 p. 155.) Thirteen local Prohibitory laws were passed in 1860 for townships, churches and schools, and four in 1866. The County Courts were given discretionary authority to grant license upon the above petition after having fixed the price of county license at $25 to $500. It was made the duty of the Collector of Revenue to prosecute persons selling without license. (Laws, 1866 No. 42.)

By the Revenue law of 1871 (Laws, No. 35, § 154), a county tax of $100 was placed upon all liquor-sellers, except where sales were exclusively for medicinal purposes. And in the election act of that year (Laws, No. 65, § 28), saloons were to be closed from 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. of the day of election and sales or gifts of liquor on that day were misdemeanors. By the Revenue law of 1873 (Laws, No. 124, § 157), a State tax of $100 was added to the above, and by § 159, selling without license was fined $200 to $1,000. For Washington County the license law was made more stringent, and civil damages resulting from intoxication were awarded against those selling the liquor in favor of any person injured thereby. (Laws, 1873, No. 127.)

The Civil Rights law of 1873 (No. 12, § 4) made it unlawful for saloon-keepers to refuse to sell drinks to any person on account of race or color, under penalty of $25 to $100.

Laws of the special session of 1874 (No. 37) provided for an annual election in each township, ward of a city and incorporated town, on the question whether licenses should be granted by the County Board of Supervisors. Each applicant for license was also to enter into bond of $2,000 to pay damages occasioned by reason of liquors drank at his house. Persons aggrieved by the keeping of a saloon, or losing money at gaming therein, were given right to action on such bond. A fine of not less than $100 and imprisonment not less than 30 days, were imposed on a person keeping a saloon without license. Six local Prohibitory laws were enacted in the session of 1874–5, six in 1879, over 20 in 1881, and about the same number at each biennial session since.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—The law as it stands was enacted in 1879, with some additions made in 1881 and 1883.

It shall be unlawful, without license, to be procured of the County Court, to sell any spirituous, ardent, vinous, malt or fermented liquor or any compound or preparation thereof, commonly called tonics, bitters or medicated liquors or intoxicating spirits, to be drunk as a beverage; provided that manufacturers may sell in the original package of not less than five gallons without license. (Dig. Laws, 1884, § 450.) The applicant for license must file his petition, specifying the place of sale, and the receipt of the Collector for the license fee. (Id., § 4509.) For such annual license he shall pay $400 as a county tax, $300 as a State tax and $2 for Clerk's fees. (Id., § 4510.) Persons selling, or keeping a saloon, without license are guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be fined double the license fee, and each day of unauthorized selling is a separate offense. (Id., §§ 4511, 4519).

At each general election for State officers the question shall be submitted to the electors whether license shall be granted in the county for the next two years. (Id., §§ 1513, 1515).

Each applicant for license shall give bond in $2,000, conditioned to pay damages caused by liquors sold. He shall, besides the above fees (§ 4510), before being licensed, pay the additional sum determined by the County Court of $50 to $200. (Id., § 4516.) The law does not apply to one who manufactures and sells wine from grapes or berries or other fruits, and who sells no other liquors. (Id., § 4520.) All the provisions of this law apply with equal force to the sale of alcohol. (Id., § 4521.) No debt for spirits sold in a saloon shall be recoverable. (Id., § 452.)

Whenever the adult inhabitants residing within three miles of any school-house, academy, college, university or other institution of learning, or of any church-house, shall desire it, and a majority thereof petition therefor, the County Court shall make an order prohibiting the sale of liquor there for two years. (Id., § 4524.) Females as well as males are included as inhabitants in above section. (Id., § 4525.)

This three-mile law does not prohibit the use of wine for sacramental purposes or sales upon a physician's prescription. But no physician may make such prescription except he has filed his affidavit with the County Clerk that he will not do so without necessity in treatment of disease. (Id., § 4526.) Persons violating this three mile law shall be fined $20 to $100. (Id., § 4527.)

Licenses are forfeited for allowing gaming upon the premises. (Id., § 1857.) Dramshop keepers allowing fighting, quarreling or disorderly conduct in their places shall be fined not over $50. (Id., § 1858.) Selling to United States soldiers forfeits license. (Id., § 1859.) Selling liquor to minors without written consent of parent or guardian, subjects to a fine of $50 to $100. (Id., § 1873.) Selling to an Indian to a fine of $1 to $500. (Id., § 1879.) Persons contemptuously offering liquor for sale within one mile of any campground during campmeeting, or of any place of meeting for worship, shall be fined not less than $10. This does not apply to licensed places of sale. (Id., §§ 1896–7.) Persons using or controlling any device to sell liquor, such as is known as the "blind tiger," or any other such are guilty of a misdemeanor. (Id., § 1926.) If any person obtains liquor in any room or place of another, by going therein or thereto and by call, sound, word or token it shall be *prima facie* evidence of the guilt of the person who owns or controls such place. (Id., § 1927.) It shall be the duty of all officers to execute and prosecute under this act. (Id., § 1923.) On oath of any person, filed with a Justice of the Peace, that any named person is violating this "blind tiger" act, the Prosecuting Attorney must prosecute such person and cause his arrest. (Id., § 1929.) Persons convicted under the "blind tiger" act shall be fined $200 to $500 and imprisoned 30 days. (Id., § 1932.) The "blind tiger" act does not apply to persons giving liquors at their residences to friends, or to licensed dealers. (Id., § 1932.) Dramshops shall not be kept open on Sunday, on penalty of $25 to $100. (Laws, 1885, No. 33.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by a majority of all the members of the two Houses, at one session; popular vote to be taken at the next general election, six months' notice to be given. A majority carries it.

California.

Early Provisions.—The first session of the Legislature taxed licenses to retail any spirituous, vinous or fermented liquors, to be granted by the Court of Sessions, $50 to $1,000, at discretion. (Laws, 1850, c. 130, § 1.) Furnishing liquor to Indians was fined $20. (Id., c. 133, § 15.) The Revenue act of the next year imposed license taxes, for county purposes, of $50. (Laws, 1851, c. 6, § 60.) The license tax was the next year but one placed at $5 to $40 per month, according to volume of business. (Laws, 1853, c. 167, art. 4, § 3.) Chapter 187, Laws of 1855, authorized the taking the sense of the people on the passage of a Prohibitory liquor law, "the provisions of which shall prohibit the manufacture and sale of all spirituous and intoxicating liquors, except for mechanical, chemical, medicinal and sacramental purposes." The proposed act was no further set out. Promises to pay for liquor sold at retail to the amount of over $5 were declared void by the Laws of 1858, c. 232. Adulteration of liquor was prohibited under penalty of $25 to $500. (Laws, 1860, c. 223, § 1.) On affidavit to a Justice of the Peace charging adulteration he was to order the seizure of not exceeding one gallon of such liquor for analysis. (Id., § 2.) No person convicted under this act was to be again licensed. (Id., § 3.) Nothing was to affect compounding of liquors by a regular physician or druggist for medicinal purposes. (Id., § 6.)

By the laws of 1863, c. 289, it was to be ascertained in every criminal action if the offense of the defendant was due to intoxication, and if so the costs and expenses to the county of the aggregate of the same were to be added pro-rata to the amounts required for license, in addition to the regular rate. Section 306 of the Penal Code, as amended in 1874, prohibiting employment of females in dance-houses where liquor is sold, was declared unconstitutional, as discriminating against the employment of a female in a lawful business on account of her sex. (Matter of Maguire, 57 Cal., 604.)

The act of 1873–4, c. 300, to permit the voters of every township or incorporated city in the State to vote on the question of granting licenses to sell intoxicating liquors was declared unconstitutional, as delegating the power of the Legislature to make laws. (Ex-parte Wall, 48 Cal., 279.)

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—Any county, city, town or township may make and enforce within its limits all such local, police, sanitary and other regulations as are not in conflict with general laws. (Const., art. 11, § 11.) Under this section it was held that the city of Pasadena might prohibit tippling houses, dramshops or barrooms where liquors were dealt in. (Ex-parte Campbell, 74 Cal., 20.) It surrenders the subject to local control entirely.

Persons selling spirituous, malt or fermented liquors or wine, in less quantities than one quart, must, on sales of $10,000 or more monthly, pay $40 per month; on such sales of $5,000 to $10,000, $20; less than $5,000, $5. (Pol. Code, § 3381.) Wholesalers, in classes according to their monthly sales, pay from $1 to $50 per month. (Id., §§ 3282–3.) No license is required of physicians, surgeons, apothecaries or chemists, for any wines or spirituous liquors they may use in the preparation of medicines. (Id., § 3383.) Sales of liquors at theatres, and employing women to sell liquors thereat are misdemeanors. (Pen. Code, § 303.) Selling liquors within one mile of a camp or field-meeting for religious worship during the time of holding such meeting, except regularly licensed businesses, is fined $5 to $500. (Pen. Code, §§ 304–5.) Every person who sells or gives to another under the age of 16 years, to be by him drank at the time as a beverage, is guilty of a misdemeanor, provided this does not apply to parents, guardians or physicians. (Pen. Code, § 306; Acts 1871, p. 231.) Selling liquor within two miles of California University, in Alameda County, is punishable by fine of $50 to $100, or imprisonment 30 to 90 days, or both. (Pol. Code, § 1405; Laws, 1873, p. 12.) Selling within one mile of Napa Insane Asylum is fined not exceeding $500. (Pol. Code, § 2222; Laws, 1873, p. 27.) Sales one mile from College City, Colusa County, are prohibited. (4 Codes & Stats., p. 617; Laws, 1875, p. 691.) The delivery of liquor by retail is invalid consideration for any promise to pay exceeding $5, and no Court will give judgment for the amount thereof. (4 Codes & Stats., p. 616; Laws, 1873, p. 509.) Sale or distribution of liquor in the Capitol Building is prohibited under penalty of $1,000. Selling on election day, while the polls are open, is a misdemeanor. (Laws, 1873, c. 198.) Selling intoxicating liquors to those addicted to the inordinate use of such liquor, after notice thereof, is punished by fine not exceeding $200 or imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both. (5 Codes & Stats., p. 542; Laws, 1889, p 352.)

The provision made in Laws, 1887 p. 46, and 5 Codes & Stats., p. 493, is a very elaborate and technical act defining pure wine, prohibiting its sophistication or adulteration and requiring labels to be marked "Pure California Wine." It was held that a failure to thus mark was not a violation of the act. (Ex-parte Kohler, 74 Cal., 38.)

The California laws also provide for a Board of State Viticultural Commissioners (to be supported from State funds), charged with the duty of promoting the interests of the wine growers and producers.

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by two-thirds of all the members of the two Houses, at one session; the popular vote must be taken at the next general election for Representatives, notice to be given "as deemed expedient." A majority carries it.

Colorado.

The history of liquor laws in this State is brief. They now exist substantially as passed at the first session of the Legislature in 1861, and re-enacted in the first Revised Statutes of 1868, except the provisions that the Board of County Commissioners may grant licenses to keep saloons, hotels, public houses or groceries upon condition that the applicant shall pay into the county Treasury $25 to $300 at the discretion of the Board, and that he shall give bond in $500 conditioned to keep an orderly house and will not permit any unlawful gaming in his house. (G. S., 1883, § 2103.)

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—The license fee for the privilege of retailing spirituous, vinous and malt liquors shall be in cities not less than $600; in incorporated towns, not less than $500; in counties, where the Board of County Commissioners may grant, $300. (Laws, 1889, p. 228, § 1.) No person shall be licensed until he has executed a bond in not less than $2,000 to be fixed by the County Commissioners or municipal authorities granting the license, conditioned that he will keep an orderly house, permit no unlawful gaming, and not violate any law or ordinance in reference to selling liquors, and pay all damages, fines, penalties and forfeitures for violating such laws and ordinances. (Id., § 2.) Licenses to sell malt liquors exclusively may be granted on payment of one-half of the above sums, respectively. (Id., § 4.) The Board upon application for license may reject or grant the same at its discretion. (G. S., 1883, § 2104.) The Board, upon complaint made to it, has power to revoke the license upon being satisfied it has been abused or that the licensee has violated the law. (Id., § 2105.) It is not plain that the Boards of Trustees of incorporated towns and the City Councils of cities have the right to revoke, or even the discretion to grant, as stated above. The Board of County Commissioners only is therefore mentioned in the General Statutes of 1883, though municipal authorities are in the next section given the exclusive authority to license in such towns and cities. (Id., § 2106, see below; Id., § 3312, p. 18.) Licenses do not authorize sales in more than one place, and must describe the place intended to be occupied. (Id., § 2106.) A saloon or grocery shall be deemed to include all places where liquors are retailed. (Id., § 2107.) Sales by persons not licensed are fined $20, half to the informer. (Id., § 2108.) This was increased to a fine of $50 to $200 by act of 1889, p. 231.

No person may sell or deliver liquor to any Indian under penalty of $50, one-half to the informer. (G. S., 1883, § 2109.) If licensee knowingly suffers disorder, drunkenness or unlawful games in his house, his license shall be suppressed by the County Commissioners. (Id., § 2110.) Persons carrying on the business without license shall be fined not exceeding $300, or imprisoned not exceeding six months, or both. (Id., § 2112.) Persons prosecuting or giving information may be competent witnesses at the trial, notwithstanding their interest in the penalty. (Id., § 2115.) Penalties may be recovered by action in debt, or by indictment, before any Justice of the Peace or Court of competent jurisdiction, upon complaint of any citizen of the county. (Id., § 2116.) No license shall be issued for more than a year or less than six months, or until the whole fee has been paid (Laws, 1889, p. 220, § 6.) No license is transferable (Id., § 7.) No license fee may be refunded for any unexpired term except in case of the death of the licensee. (Id., § 8.) City Councils and Town Boards of Trustees have the exclusive right to license, regulate or prohibit the selling or giving away of any intoxicating liquor within the limits of the town or city or within one mile beyond, such authorities complying with the general laws of the State in force. (G. S., 1883, § 3312, p. 18.) The same authorities may grant permits to druggists to sell liquor for medicinal, mechanical, sacramental and chemical purposes only. (Id.) They may also forbid and punish the selling to minors, apprentices, insane, idiotic or distracted persons, drunkards, or intoxicated persons. (Id., p. 19.) Retailers selling or giving liquor to common drunkards shall be fined $50. (G. S., 1883, § 853.) Any person procuring liquor for any habitual drunkard knowingly shall be fined $100 to $300, or imprisoned three to 12 months, or both. (Id., § 854.) Selling to United States troops or State militia is punished by imprisonment not exceeding three months, or fine not exceeding $50, and forfeiture of license. (Id., § 855.)

If any person sell liquor between sunrise and sunset of any general election, or election for Mayor of any incorporated place, he shall for the first offense forfeit $10 to $100, and for the second $50 to $200. (Id., § 856.) This section does not apply to wholesalers of over 20 gallons. (Id., § 857.) Saloons shall be closed election day, under penalty of $50 or 20 days' imprisonment, or both. (Id., § 1220.) Any person selling liquors within one mile of any gathering of citizens assembled for worship, unless a regularly-licensed business, shall be fined not over $100; this not applying to persons selling at their own distillery, store or dwelling-house. (Id., § 878.)

Every person, relative or employer injured in person, property or means of support by the intoxication of anyone, has his action against the seller of the liquor, if such seller has been notified not to sell to such person. (Id., § 1034; Act, 1879, p. 92.)

The importation of, or bringing into this State of any spurious or adulterated vinous or malt liquors, is prohibited. (Laws, 1887, p. 18, § 1.) The compounding, manufacture or sale of any such spurious liquors is prohibited. (Id., § 2.) Any such liquor found to contain any thing other than the extract or property of the juice of the grape, or than the quality or property of malt and hops combined with water, respectively, is spurious. (Id., § 3.) No vinous or malt liquors shall be offered for sale, unless the package be plainly marked or stamped with the manufacturer's name and place, and the words "pure" ale, "pure" wine, etc., as the case may be. (Id., § 4.) No dealer in liquors shall keep in his possession any spurious liquors. (Id., § 5.) Any person violating this act shall be fined $1 to $500 or imprisoned not exceeding six months, or both. (Id., § 6.) Justices of the Peace have jurisdiction, except under § 5, when the party if not discharged upon hearing shall be held to bail to the next District Court. (Id., § 7.) For two years, and until otherwise provided, fines collected under this law shall belong to the prosecuting witness. (Id., § 8.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by two-thirds of all the members of the two Houses, at one session; popular vote to be taken at the next general election for Representatives, three months' notice to be given. A majority vote carries it.

Connecticut.

Colonial Provisions.—No one was to sell wine or strong water without license. (Colonial Records, vol. 1, p. 100 [1643].) Tippling in "ordinaries" was prohibited. (Id., p. 154 [1647].) So was selling to Indians, under penalty of 40*s* to £5. (Id., p. 254.) A small excise of 40*s* per hhd. of wine, etc., was levied in 1654. (Id., p. 255.) The rates at which liquors were to be sold were fixed in 1656. (Id., p. 283.) A penalty of 5*s* per quart for liquor sold without license was imposed in 1659. (Id., p. 332.) A fee of 2*s* 6*d* for license to retail liquor, to be obtained of the General Court, was required in the same year. (Id.) If any person was found drunk at any private house he was fined 20*s*, and the owner of the house 10*s*. (Id., p. 333.) Distillation of corn or malt into liquor was prohibited at the same time.

Ludlow's Code, 1650 (Id., p. 533), provided, under title "Innkeepers," and Introduction: "Forasmuch as there is a necessary use of houses of common entertainment in every Commonwealth, and of such as retail wine, beer and victuals, yet because there are so many abuses of that lawful liberty, both by persons entertaining and persons entertained, there is also need of strict laws to regulate such an employment." It was ordered that no such licensed person should suffer any to be drunken or drink excessively (viz., above half a pint at a time), or to tipple above the space of half an hour, or at unreasonable times, or after 9 o'clock at night, on penalty of 5*s*; and every person found drunk, so as to be bereaved or disabled in the use of his understanding, appearing in his speech or gesture, 10*s*; for excessive drinking, 3*s* 4*d*; for tippling over half an hour, 2*s* 6*d*, and for tippling at unreasonable times or after 9 o'clock, 5*s*. It was provided, however, that travelers and strangers might be kept and entertained in an orderly manner. Drunkenness and excessive or long drinking for second offenses were fined double the above amounts, and in default the first kind of offense were to be given ten stripes, and the second three hours in the stocks. The other above several regulations were also duly codified.

It was ordered that only the Ordinary in each town should sell wine and strong waters. (1 New Haven Col. Rec., p. 27 [1646].) And it was provided that no one should retail liquors without license upon penalty of £5. (2 Id., p. 595 [1656].) The law was shortly codified in an act which added whipping at discretion for those selling without license and not able to pay their fines. (Conn. Col. Rec., 1689–1706, p. 436.) Selling liquor without license was fined £5, to be doubled for each succeeding offense, half to the complainant; and officers were to post the names of tavern-haunters at the doors of taverns, and selling to them afterwards was fined £5, and their drinking thereafter 20*s*. (Id., p. 562.)

Early State Provisions.—Selling without license was fined $10, doubled for each subsequent offense, half to the informer. (Laws, 1806, p. 728.) Cider, ale and beer were excepted from the law by Laws of 1810, p. 33. Retailers of liquor not to be drunk on the premises were authorized to be licensed the same as innkeepers and pay $5 for their licenses and forfeit $50 for illegal selling. (Laws, 1813, c. 12.) All laws then in force regulating the sale of spirituous liquors were repealed, and it was provided that no person excepting taverners should sell any liquor to be drank in his house or place, upon penalty of $5. (Laws, 1842, c. 27.) No one was to sell on the highway, in a booth, or any place erected or located for temporary purposes, on public days, at camp meetings, or on any temporary occasion, under penalty of $7. (Laws, 1844, c. 36, § 1.) No jailor could sell on his premises. (Id., § 2.)

By the act of 1845, c. 50, three special Commissoners were to be elected annually by each town, who only should grant licenses to such persons, under such limitations and restrictions, as they judged proper, and revoke the same at pleasure. Violators of the act were fined $10 to $100. This act was repealed by the Laws of 1846, c. 56; and by the next act of the same year, taverners only were authorized to sell to be drunk on the premises, under penalty of $10, half to the informer. By § 2 of that act no person but a taverner was to keep any house or place for the sale of liquor, under penalty of $30. And by § 3 no person was to sell to common drunkards under penalty of $10.

Connecticut's Maine Law of 1854.—An elaborate Prohibitory or Maine law, against the manufacture and sale of liquor (only excepting cider and native wine in quantities of five gallons or over), providing for Town Agents to sell for sacramental, medicinal, chemical and mechanical purposes only, providing penalty of $10 for first conviction and $20 and imprisonment three to six months for subsequent convictions for selling, and $100 for first, $200 for second and $200 and four months in prison for third offenses of being a common seller, with search and seizure clauses, was submitted to the vote of the people on the first Monday of April, 1854. (Laws, 1853, p. 151.) Such an act, more elaborate and with somewhat heavier penalties, was enacted on June 22, 1854. (Laws, c. 57.)

Persons found intoxicated were fined not exceeding $7 by the Laws of 1859, c. 58. The section (19) of the Liquor act giving Selectmen, Constables, Mayors and Aldermen the powers of Grand Jurors to prosecute under the act, was repealed by Laws of 1860, c. 7. And § 27 of said law, which made sales of liquor void and not actionable, was repealed by Laws of 1861, c. 50. And by Laws of 1863, c. 22, it was enacted that nothing in the Prohibitory liquor act should impair the obligation of any contract. This was a reversal of the common law that contracts made in violation of law are nonenforceable. This policy was again reversed, and rights acquired by the sale of liquors were again made null and void. (Laws of 1872, c. 71.) The manufacture or sale of adulterated liquor was punished by fine not exceeding $500, or imprisonment, not exceeding one year, or both, by Laws of 1865, c. 61.

In 1867 a license law was enacted and held in suspension until the next session, accompanied by the majority report of a committee in favor of it and against the Prohibitory liquor law then in force. (Laws, 1867, p. 182.) The next Legislature did not concur. In 1869 was passed a law (c. 136) providing for a State Chemist and analysis by him of liquors, which is still in force and will be noticed below. Liquor-shops were prohibited to keep open on Sunday, in 1872. (Laws, c. 82.)

License and Local Option (1872).—The Prohibition law was impliedly repealed in 1872 by the passage of a law authorizing the County Commissioners to license applicants recommended by a majority of the Selectmen of the towns, though the towns might instruct such Selectmen to so recommend no one for license. The license fee was $100, and the penalty for violation $20. (Laws, 1872, c. 99.) The license fee was made $100 to $500 at discretion, in each case, and district licenses for the sale of beer, ale, and Rhine wine only, were provided for, as were agents to be appointed by the County Commissioners, to prosecute for violations, by Laws of 1874, c. 115. By the Laws of 1875, c. 104, the County Commissioners were to pay moneys received for licenses to the several towns. By Laws of 1878, c. 137, the Mayors of cities, Wardens of boroughs and Selectmen of towns might close saloons between 12 P. M. Saturday night and 12 P. M. Sunday night following. Town Agents, to sell for medicinal and similar purposes only, in towns voting against license, were provided for by Laws of 1879, c. 66. Twenty-five per cent. of the license moneys was awarded to the counties by Laws of 1879, c. 107. The Clerk of the Superior Court was to keep a record of all licenses. (Id., c. 124.)

Prohibitory Amendments Proposed.—In 1880 (Laws, p. 601) a Prohibitory law with all the ordinary provisions was proposed, but never finally enacted. And in 1882 (Laws, p. 224) a Prohibitory Amendment to the Constitution was proposed to the next Legislature, which was not concurred in. Another such Amendment was proposed in 1887 (Laws, p. 766), concurred in, submitted to the people (Laws, 1889, c. 163), and defeated at the polls.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—The term spirituous and intoxicating liquors shall be held to include all spirituous and intoxicating liquors, all mixed liquors, all mixed liquor of which a part is spirituous and intoxicating, all distilled spirits, all wines, ale and porter, all beer manufactured from hops and malt, or from hops and barley, and all beer on the receptacle containing which the laws of the United States require a revenue stamp to be affixed, and all fermented cider, sold to be drunk on the premises, or in quantities of less than five gallons (made one gallon by Laws of 1889, c. 157), to be delivered at one time. (G. S., 1888, § 3048.)

Upon petition of 25 voters of a town, the Selectmen must submit the question of license to the next annual town meeting. Licenses not in accordance with that vote are void. (Id., §§ 3050-1.) Whenever a town has so voted against license, delivery of liquor by the vendor or his agent in such town shall be deemed a sale within such town, although the contract of sale was made outside the town. (Id., § 3052.)

The County Commissioners may license, for a period not extending beyond the first Monday of the month next after the next annual town meeting, by licenses signed by themselves, suitable persons to sell liquors in suitable places. (Id., § 3053.) But no person who has been convicted of a violation of liquor law, or paid a fine to settle such a prosecution, or forfeited his bond to appear to answer such charges, shall be deemed a suitable person. (Id., am'd by Laws, 1889, c, 117.) The County Commissioners shall, on or before the 10th of every month, report to the Town Treasurers the licenses granted and the money received therefor. (G. S., 1888, § 3054.) The said Commissoners shall pay 5 per cent. of such license moneys to the County Treasurers, and on the first of the next month shall pay the rest of the money to the Town Treasurers. (Id., §§ 3055-6.) The Com missioners shall report, by the 1st of December, specifically, of all licenses granted by them for the year ending June 30 preceding. (Id., § 3057.) They may, upon complaint made of any violation of the law, revoke any license; and they have the power of Justices of the Peace for the purpose of a hearing thereon. (Id., § 3058.) Any prosecuting agent, of his own motion or upon complaint of two legal voters, may prefer charges before the Commissioners, who shall within 14 days summon the accused to appear and show reason why his license should not be revoked. (Id., § 3059.) The fees of the prosecuting agent shall be $5 per day, those of others the same as in ordinary criminal cases, to be taxed, drawn and paid by the Commissioners. (Id., § 3060.) Such revocation is not subject to appeal. On revocation, the Treasurer of the county shall sue on the bond, and on proof of any violation of the conditions thereof recover the full amount of the bond. (Id., § 3061.) County Commissioners shall not deal in liquors, or become surety on the bond of any person licensed. (Id., § 3062.)

Application for license shall be signed by the applicant and five electors and taxpayers of the town. It shall specify the building wherein liquor is to be sold. And, if within 200 feet of church or public-school premises, it shall state the distance. The Town Clerk shall certify as to the signers. The application shall be then transmitted to the Commissioners, and a copy of the application filed with the Clerk, who shall advertise the same in some paper of the town, or if none, by posting, two weeks before the hearing thereon by the Commissioners. The expense of advertising or posting, and 50 cents, shall be paid to the Clerk on the filing. Any person of the town may file with the Commissioners any objection to the granting of the license, and the Commissioners shall give five days' notice of the hearing on the objection, when they shall decide whether to grant the license or not. (Id., § 3063.) Before license, a bond in $3,000 shall be filed with the Commissioners, and no liquor-dealer can be a surety thereon. Any conviction of violation of the law forfeits the bond, and the Treasurer must sue upon it and shall recover the full amount thereof. (Id., § 3064.)

The license fee shall be $100 to $500, as the Commissioners shall determine, in each case, except in towns of less than 3,000 people, when it shall be $100 for all liquors, and $50 for ale, lager beer, cider and Rhine wine only; and for portions of a year, such proportion as the Commissioners judge proper. A druggist's license to sell for compounding prescriptions, and upon prescriptions, shall be $12, or $10 in towns of less than 5,000 inhabitants. Druggists' licenses to sell in quantities not exceeding one gallon, not to be drunk on the premises, are $50; and druggists' licenses to sell only on prescription, not to be drunk on the premises, in No-License towns, $12. (Id., § 3064.) One sale only shall be made on one prescription. (Id., § 3065.) Prescriptions shall be dated and filed by the druggist. (Id., § 3066.) Druggists must sign an application for license, to be lodged with the Commissioners two weeks, and objections may be made as in other cases, and revocation the same way. (Id., § 3067.) Druggists' licenses shall contain the words, "This license does not authorize the sale of spirituous or intoxicating liquor to be drunk on the premises." (Id., § 3068.)

Every license shall specify the building and town, and authorizes sales in no other place, and shall be made revocable, in terms, for violation of law. The Commissioners may indorse the license with permission to remove to another specified building in the town. (Id., § 3069.) All licenses shall have plainly printed on their faces §§ 3092 and 3094, G. S. (Id., § 3070.) On the death of a licensee, his executors or administrators may, with the consent of the Commissioners, transfer his license to a suitable person, who must himself make application and execute bond as for original license. (Id., § 3071.) Every one shall have his license framed and hung in plain view in the room of sale, on penalty of $5. (Id., § 3072.) The Clerk of the Superior Court of the county shall keep a record of all licenses. Persons not having their licenses so recorded shall be fined $5 a week. A certificate of such Clerk that any person is or is not duly licensed, or that his license has been revoked, is *prima facie* evidence. (Id., § 3073.)

No liquors shall be sold in any State, county or town building. No license shall be granted for any building used as a dwelling-house, except a hotel, until access from the dwelling portion has been effectually closed; and if any such way is opened it forfeits the license. (Id., § 3074.) No license shall be granted to any Sheriff, Constable, Grand Juror, Justice of the Peace, Prosecuting Agent, Selectman (except such Selectman is a hotel-keeper), or to any female not known to be a woman of good repute, or any female member of the household of a person who has been refused license or who has forfeited his license, or to a house of ill-fame or place reputed to be a house of ill-fame, or to any person keeping a gambling place. (Id., § 3074.)

Whenever any licensee is convicted of a violation of §§ 3087–3101 he shall, in addition to the other penalties, forfeit his license, and the Commissioners shall revoke it and he may not be licensed again for a year. (Id., § 3075.)

License to sell is not required of importers into the United States of liquors remaining in the original packages. (Id., § 3076.) Executors or administrators, or the trustees of an insolvent estate, may sell the liquors belonging to the estate in one lump, to a regularly-licensed dealer only. (Id., § 3077.) No person shall sell liquor by sample, by soliciting orders, without taking out a license; but if he does so he may solicit orders in any town where liquor may be legally sold. (Id., § 3078.) Whenever any license has been obtained by fraud, the Commissioners may revoke the same without refunding moneys paid therefor. (Id., § 3079.) No licensee shall employ any minor as a bartender or porter on his place, on penalty of revocation of his license by the Commissioners. (Id., § 3080.) All liquors intended to be sold unlawfully shall, together with the vessels containing them, be deemed nuisances. (Id., § 3081.)

Any Justice of the Peace or Police Court, upon the sworn complaint of two voters or of any prosecuting agent, setting forth with reasonable certainty as to the kind of liquor, place and owner, that such liquors are intended to be sold in violation of law, may issue a warrant directing any police or other officer to search the premises and seize the liquor. If the place is a dwelling-house, the prosecuting agent or one of the said complainants shall make oath that he believes unlawful sales have been made there within 30 days. And the Justices or Court must find that there is an adequate reason for such belief (Id., § 3082.) On such seizure the Justice or Court shall within two days post and leave at the place of seizure, and at the usual residence of the owner, a summons notifying him and all concerned to appear in six to 12 days to show cause why the liquor is not a nuisance. (Id., § 3083.) The costs under the last two sections shall be paid by the town except when paid by defendants. (Id., § 3084; see Laws, 1889, c. 48, § 1.) The Court shall direct by warrant, if the complaint is sustained, some officer to destroy the liquor. If judgment be that the liquor is not a nuisance the Court shall direct that it be restored and the costs taxed and paid as in case of acquittal of a criminal charge. (G. S., 1888, § 3085; am'd by Laws, 1889, c. 48, § 2.) All proceedings for seizure shall be *in rem*, and conducted as civil actions, and the defendants have the right of appeal (G. S., 1888, § 3086.)

Any person selling without license, or contrary to his license, shall for the first offense be fined not more than $50, for the second shall be fined $50 and imprisoned 30 days, for third and subsequent ones, $100 and 60 days imprisonment. (Id., § 3087.) Every person keeping a bar or place in which it is reputed liquors are kept without license, shall be fined not over $30. (Id., § 3088.)

The Selectmen shall semi annually prepare a list of those persons aided by the town who use liquor, and lodge a copy thereof, forbidding sales to such persons, or their families except upon prescription, also signed by the Selectmen, with every licensed dealer in town. (Id., § 3089.) Every licensee who sells to such persons after such notice, shall be fined $10 to $50, or imprisoned 10 to 60 days, or both. (Id., § 3090.) Whenever any person shall complain to the Selectmen that his father, mother, husband, wife, child or ward is addicted to the excessive use of liquors, the Selectmen, believing the same, upon request, shall notify every licensed dealer in town not to sell to such person so designated. Such notices remain in force as long as the dealer is annually licensed, or may be revoked in a year by the Selectmen. (Id., § 3091; am'd by Laws, 1889, c. 136.) Licensees who deliver liquor to a minor for his or any other person's use, or to any intoxicated person, or to any husband or wife after receiving notice from wife or husband, respectively, not to do so, or knowingly to any habitual drunkard, or to any persons after a Selectmen's notice, as in last section, or allow any minors to loiter upon their premises, shall be fined not more than $50, or be imprisoned 10 to 60 days, or both. (G. S., 1888, § 3092.)

Every person keeping open any place for the sale of liquor to be drank on the premises on election day shall be fined $50. (Id., 3093; Laws, 1889, c. 197.) Licensees shall not keep open their places between 11 P. M. and 5 A. M., on penalty of $25 to $50; but this does not apply to druggists; and the town, or the authorities of any city, borough, or town, may fix the hour of closing as late as 12 P. M. (G. S., 1888, § 3094.)

Druggists violating §§ 3087–3101 shall be fined $50 to $100. (Id., § 3095.) Any person violating §§ 3065–6 shall be fined $25 to $100. (Id., § 3096.)

Keeping open a saloon or reputed place of sale of liquor, or gaming place on Sunday from midnight to midnight, shall be punished by fine of $50 to $100, or imprisonment not more than six months, or both; but this does not apply to druggists. (Id., § 3097.)

Every jailer, prison keeper or other officer who shall furnish liquor to any prisoner under his charge, except as medicine, shall be fined $20. (Id., § 3098.) Every person who delivers liquor to any prisoner without permission of the keeper shall be fined $10. (Id., § 3099.)

Persons manufacturing adulterated liquors shall be fined not over $250, half to the informer. (Id., § 3100.)

Persons selling liquor to be drunk on their premises shall be liable for any damages to the person or property of another, caused by the intoxication of the person so sold to. (Id., § 3101.)

Prosecutions may be before Justices of the Peace or any City or Police Courts, but no such Justice shall fine more than $100 or imprison more than 60 days. An original information may, in all cases, be filed in the Superior Court by the State's Attorney. (Id., § 3102.) The County Commissioners, subject to the approval of a Judge of the Superior Court, may appoint one or more persons as prosecuting agents, who shall inquire into and prosecute for violations of this law. They shall render monthly accounts of their doings to the Commissioners and hold office two years, unless sooner removed. Selling liquor vacates their offices. (Id., § 3103.) Prosecuting agents shall receive not exceeding $10 (to be taxed by the Court) in each case. (Id., § 3104.)

Whenever a person arrested for intoxication discloses to the prosecuting officer where and how he procured the liquor, and testifies at the trial of the accused, such evidence shall not be used against him for his intoxication. (Id., § 3105.)

Any officer having a warrant for the arrest of a person for keeping a house of ill-fame or disorderly house, or keeping open on Sunday, or for the seizure of liquors, may make forcible entry into the place described, after demanding admittance as an officer. The County Commissioners, the Sheriff, the Chief of Police or any Deputy Sheriff, or policeman specially authorized by such Sheriff or Chief, respectively, may at any time enter upon the premises of any licensee, to see how the business is conducted and to preserve order. (Id., § 3106.)

Whenever liquor is found in possession of one having a United States "license," such "license" shall be *prima facie* evidence that the liquor was intended for sale. (Id., § 3107.)

Where towns have voted against license therein, the Selectmen shall appoint one agent for every 5,000 inhabitants or fraction thereof in said town, to sell liquor for sacramental, medicinal, chemical and mechanical purposes only. He holds office one year, or until removed. The Selectmen shall authorize the Town Treasurer to furnish said agent necessary money to purchase liquor for the agency. (Id., § 3109.) Such agent shall give bonds in $500, to be forfeited to the town on any violation of the rules in relation to his agency. (Id., § 3110.) He shall sell only at the place designated. He shall purchase and sell according to rules of the Selectmen. He shall keep an accurate account of his purchases and sales, as to quantity, kind, price, date and names, and residence of sellers to him, and buyers from him, and in the latter case, the use to which the liquor was to be put. This account shall be open to the Selectmen, Grand Jurors and prosecuting agents, and the civil authority. (Id., § 3111.) He shall sell liquor at not over 25 per cent. advance on cost, and shall receive compensation not dependent on his sales, fixed by the Selectmen. (Id., § 3112.) Persons purchasing of him, who make false representations of the use to which the liquors are to be put, shall be fined $50 or imprisoned not over 60 days, or both. (Id., § 3113.)

All contracts, any part of the consideration of which has been the illegal sale of liquor, are void, and action cannot be maintained to recover upon the same. (Id., § 3114.)

Whenever a town that has voted No-License reverses that vote, the liquors in the hands of the Town Agent may be sold by the Selectmen at wholesale. (Id., § 3115.)

When in any liquor prosecution any sample of such liquor is presented in Court, it may order such sample conveyed to a State Chemist for analysis. (Id., § 3116.) State Chemists shall analyze such samples, keeping a record of the same, copies of which shall be legal evidence of the facts. (Id., § 3117.) Liquors may be levied upon and sold, on execution, in the same manner as other personal property, without license, in quantities of not less than five gallons. (Id., § 1159.)

No part of the buildings or grounds of an agricultural fair shall be leased for the sale of liquor. (Id., § 1723.) No person shall sell liquor within 1 000 feet of such grounds, on penalty of not more than $50 for the first offense, $50 and 30 days' imprisonment for the second, and $100 and 60 days for third and subsequent offenses. (Id., § 1725.) The commanding officer of any encampment or parade may prohibit the sale of liquor within one mile thereof. (Id., § 3187.)

Every person found intoxicated shall be fined $1 to $20, or imprisoned not over 30 days. (Id., § 1542.) Any Justice of the Peace having personal knowledge of any drunkenness may render judgment thereon, without previous complaint or warrant, having the person first brought before him. (Id., § 689.)

Physiology and hygiene relating especially to the effects of liquors, stimulants and narcotics on the system, shall be taught in the public schools, and teachers must be qualified therein. (Id., § 2141.)

In towns that have voted No-License, all places used for clubs or societies where liquor is sold or distributed to the members thereof, shall be deemed common nuisances. (Laws, 1889, c. 127.) And whoever keeps or assists in keeping such nuisance, shall be fined not more than $50. (Id.)

Town Clerks within 10 days after election shall return to the Secretary of State the number of votes for and against license. (Laws, 1889, c. 115; G. S., 1888, § 54.)

No Agent shall procure and deliver liquors for any one not licensed to sell, without a written order from such person or firm therefor. Such Agent shall keep such orders on file, and produce the same when called for by any prosecuting agent or Grand Juror, under penalty of § 3087 G. S. (Laws, 1889, c. 187.)

A druggist shall not sell on physicians' prescriptions, unless they state kind and quantity, name, date and residence, the need of the liquor, and are signed by physicians (who shall be known to the druggist); they must be filled within three days. (Laws, 1889, c. 199, § 1.) Such prescriptions shall be filed and entered in a book, and such entry shall be open for inspection, and be sufficient evidence of sale. (Id., § 2.) Physicians knowingly issuing prescriptions falsely, as procured for a beverage, shall be fined $25 to $50, and druggists violating this law shall be fined $50 to $100. (Id., § 3.)

Town or probate records shall not be kept where liquor is sold as a beverage, on penalty of $7 to $100. (Laws, 1889, c. 27.)

Disclosure, by a person prosecuted for intoxication, shall be requested by the prosecuting officer, and, if refused, the accused shall be committed for contempt for 10 to 30 days. (Laws, 1889, c. 167.)

No premises where liquor is sold shall be obstructed by any curtain or screen, to prevent a view of the bar and interior from the street during times when sales are prohibited, on penalty of not more than $50 or imprisonment not more than 30 days, or both. (Id., c. 112.) This does not apply to druggists. (Id.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by a majority of either House, and if at the next session this is concurred in by two-thirds of each House a special election on the question may be ordered—a majority vote of the people being necessary to adoption.

There is a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. (R. S., 1888, § 2141; passed in 1886, c. 116.)

Dakota Territory.

The first Legislature authorized license by the County Commissioners for $10 to $100, fined sales without license $30 to $100, and made it the duty of public officers to make complaint of violations of the law. (Laws, 1862, c. 83.) Selling or giving liquor to Indians was punished by imprisonment, 30 to 90 days, and fine of $20 to $100, and prosecutions by officers and individuals were provided for. (Laws, 1862, c. 47.) The License law of 1864 (c. 23) included other businesses than liquor-selling, increased the saloon license from $25 to $300, and gave the Board of Commissioners discretion to grant and revoke.

The License law was made somewhat stronger by Laws of 1872, c. 25. Damages caused by an intoxicated person were awarded against the liquor-seller, and the real estate upon which the sales were made was made liable therefor. By c 26 of the same year, selling on election days was punished by fine of $25 to $100 and imprisonment for not exceeding 20 days.

A more elaborate license law was passed in 1879. (Laws, c. 26.) It provided license fees of $200 to $500 to be fixed by the Commissioners, increased the penalty for violation to a fine of $100 to $300 or imprisonment not exceeding 60 days or both, and provided for a druggist's license to sell for medicinal purposes upon prescription.

This law was amended by c. 71, Laws of 1887, to make the license fee from $500 to $1 000. Sales within half a mile of fairs, within three miles of the University of Dakota, and in Iroquois and Denver, were prohibited by Special Laws of 1885, c. 3 § 12; c. 150, and c. 49, respectively. Prohibition by Local Option was provided for on petition of one-third of the voters of any county, and a majority vote on submission of the question at time of general elections. (Laws, 1887, c. 70.) Injunction was provided to be issued against violators of this act. (Id., § 5.)

All these laws are now, of course, repealed by the adoption, in the States of North and South Dakota, of Prohibitory Constitutional provisions. (See *North Dakota* and *South Dakota*.)

Delaware.

Colonial Provisions.—A general license law of 1740 required all keepers of inns or alehouses to obtain licenses of the Governor, by recommendation of the Justices of the Court of Quarter Sessions; and none but fit persons with suitable places were to be recommended. Suffering tippling at unseasonable hours, gaming or drunkenness was fined 20*s*; for a second offense, 40*s* to £5, and for a third was punished by suppression of license and disqualification to receive one for three years. Selling liquor without license was fined £5. The Justices might settle rates and prices at such houses, which were to be posted. (Laws, vol. 1, p. 192) No Sheriff or jailer was to keep a tavern or sell liquor to prisoners. (Id., p. 207.)

Early State Provisions.—Justices of the Peace were not to hold court at an inn. (2 Id., p. 1052 [1792]) Tavern-keepers or any persons promoting horse-racing, foot-racing, cock-fighting or shooting matches, and selling liquor to those assembled thereat, were to have their licenses suppressed, and be fined £10. (3 Id, p. 230 [1802].) Tavern licenses were to pay $12 (4 Id., p 261 [1809].) The penalty for permitting tippling, drunkenness and gambling was placed at $10, $20 for second offense, $30 and forfeiture of license and disqualification three years for third; for selling without license, it was $14. (Laws, 1827, c 28.)

By the Laws of 1841, c. 301, applications for inn licenses in Wilmington were required to pass the City Council. Laws requiring all retailers of goods, wares and merchandise to take out licenses and pay fees according to value of stock, but not in excess of $30, were passed in 1843, 1845 and 1847, the first one taking the place of an act of 1822. By Laws of 1845, c. 83, tavern licenses with the privilege of selling spirituous liquors were fixed at $12; without such privilege $5; penalty for selling liquor by licensees of the latter class, $14 and forfeiture of license.

Local Option and Prohibitory Legislation of 1847-57.—License or No-License (and consequent Prohibition) was submitted to the people to decide, by Laws of 1847, c. 186. This was declared unconstitutional, as a delegation of the legislative authority to make laws. (Rice v. Foster, 3 Harring, 479.) Selling liquor as a beverage by keepers of public houses, was prohibited, upon penalty of $20 for first and $50 for second offense. (Laws, 1851, c. 597.) Later, the recommendation of a majority of the voters in any school-district was required for license to sell liquor, together with a recommendation to the Governor, by the Judges of General Sessions. The fee was fixed at $25; penalty for violation, $20. (Laws, 1853, §§ 2-5.) Tavern-keepers were exempted from this provision, but were allowed to sell only for consumption within their houses. (Id., § 6.) Alehouses were prohibited. (Id., § 8.) Records of applications for license were required to be kept by the Clerks of the Peace. (Id., § 10.) A Prohibitory liquor or Maine law was passed in 1855. (Laws, c. 255.) This act, and the act last above it, were repealed by c. 330 of Laws of 1857.

Return to License.—By the act of 1857, c. 438, licenses to sell liquors were granted at from $20 to $50, without recommendation. Penalties for unlawful sales were placed at $5 to $10, with forfeiture of license for third offense. The act of 1861, c. 107, required the recommendation of the Grand Jury to obtain licenses, and that licenses be hung up in the barroom. Selling or distributing liquor in a concert saloon was prohibited by Laws of 1863, c. 295. Recommendation by the Judges of the Court of General Sessions was substituted for that of the Grand Jury by Laws of 1864, c. 413.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—No person shall sell intoxicating liquor except as hereinafter provided. (Revised Code, 1874, p. 259, § 1.) The Secretary of State shall furnish licenses to the Clerks of the Peace to issue. (Id., § 2.) All officers having knowledge of violations of this act shall proceed against the delinquents. (Id., p. 260, § 4.) Licenses shall be conspicuously hung up in the place of business. (Id., § 5.) It is the duty of the Court to charge this act to the Grand Jury, and their duty to present all violators they individually know of. (Id., § 7.) Any retailer of goods or druggist of good character, and whose stock is worth not less than $500, may be licensed to sell liquor in the same way as a tavern is licensed; but in the case of the druggist, he can retail only in quantities greater than a quart, and in the other case, not less than a half gallon (Id., § 8), not to be drunk on the premises, upon penalty of $50 to $100. (Id., § 9.)

To be licensed as a tavern-keeper, application must be made to the Clerk of the Peace, describing his place, stating that he has tavern accommodations for travelers, and that an inn there is necessary. (Id., p. 261, § 1.) He shall publish his intention to apply three times in two papers, and shall file a certificate of 12 citizens (half of them freeholders) or 24 in Wilmington. (Id.; § 2; Laws, 1889, c. 555, § 3.) The application is laid before the Court of General Sessions, which, at its discretion, marks it approved or not approved, and the license issued or not, accordingly. (Id., §§ 11, 12.)

Licensees, selling liquor on Sunday or election day to a minor, insane person, habitual drunkard or intoxicated person, are fined $50 to $100, and on second conviction forfeit their licenses and are disqualified to be licensed two years. (Id., p. 262, § 14.) No secret door shall be allowed, no disorderly or lewd conduct or gambling; nor shall any pawn be taken for liquor under the same penalty. No debt for liquor retailed is collectable. (Id., § 15.) Any one found drunk or excited by liquor, and noisy in any public place, may be arrested and locked up, and on hearing be recommitted five days or fined not exceeding $10. (Id., § 16.) The sale of liquor not herein authorized is a misdemeanor and fined $50 to $100. (Id., p 263, § 19.) This act does not apply to manufacturers of liquors, wine or cider, selling not less than one quart, not to be drunk upon the premises. (Id., § 20.)

Hereafter no licenses shall be granted to any *person* to sell intoxicating liquors, but they shall authorize sale thereof to be made in some *house* described in the petition. The owner of the house shall be petitioner for license, which shall be granted as before. (Laws, 1881, c. 384, § 1.) Judgments for violations of the liquor laws shall be liens on the premises licensed. (Id., § 2.)

A druggist must take oath not to sell over $75 worth of liquor during the year. (Id., § 3.)

If any tenant is convicted of violating the law his lease is made void if the landlord is not privy to such violation. (Id., § 4.)

A tax of 10 cents a gallon is laid on liquors manufactured. (Id., § 6.)

The Court may take official notice that spirituous, mixed or fermented liquors, except cider, are intoxicating. (Id., § 7.)

Conviction of the owner or occupier of premises, of unlawful sales, makes the continuance of the business thereafter a nuisance, which may be, by addition to the judgment of the Court, suppressed; and the Sheriff shall seize and hold the building. (Id., § 9.)

Where there is no specific penalty in this act, it shall be $100 and imprisonment one to six months, and forfeiture of license. (Id., § 12.)

Whenever it is shown that any injury has been caused to any one of known intemperate habits, in consequence of sales to him of liquor, the wife, husband or children may recover of the vendor actual and exemplary but not excessive damages. (Id., § 14.)

There shall be a special bailiff for Wilmington, for the special duty of searching out violations of the liquor laws. (Id., § 10.)

Provisions shall be made immediately for instructing all pupils in physiology and hygiene, with special reference to the effects of alcoholic drinks, stimulants and narcotics upon the human system. Teachers must pass satisfactory examinations therein. (Laws, 1887, c. 69.)

Druggists may not sell intoxicating liquors unless licensed to sell the same, and then only upon physician's prescription. Such sales shall be but one on each prescription, which itself must be filed by pasting in a book open to the public, upon penalty of $100. (Laws, 1889, c. 555, § 1.)

The price of tavern licenses shall be $300 in cities of over 10,000 inhabitants; elsewhere, $200; druggist's license, $20; retailer of merchandise, $100. (Id., § 2.)

Licensed places shall be kept so as to be seen, fully, and easily, by passers-by, and not obstructed by screens, blinds, frosted glass or any other device, upon penalty of $50 to $100. (Id., § 4.)

In case tavern-proprietors die, the executor or administrator may assign the license with the approval of the associate Judges, as the proprietor himself might have. (Laws, 1889, c. 554.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by two-thirds of each House, with the approbation of the Governor; if ratified by a three-fourths vote in the next Legislature, it goes to the people, who may adopt it by a majority.

District of Columbia.

See UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Florida.

Earliest Provisions.—The Revenue act of the first Legislature of Florida taxed tavern-keepers, or persons retailing spirituous liquors, $20 in cities and $5 in the country. (Laws, 1822, p. 67.) This was made $5 except in St. Augustine by the Laws of 1827, p. 49, and $5 everywhere by the Laws of 1828, p 236, for tavern-keepers, and $2 for retailers of spirituous liquors selling under half a gallon. Selling liquor to slaves, without express license of their owners, was punished with fine not exceeding $100 and imprisonment not exceeding three months. (Laws, 1834, c. 753.) Retailers of spirituous liquors received licenses of the County Clerks on payment of $25, and on giving bond in $100 for keeping orderly houses. The penalty for selling without license was a fine of not over $500 and imprisonment not exceeding three months. (Laws, 1840, No. 42.) The law against selling liquor to slaves, free negroes or mulattos, without written permission of the master of the slave or guardian of the free negro or mulatto, was modified in 1842, a fine of $20 being imposed, one-half to the informer. (Laws, 1842, c. 17.)

The Revenue act of 1845 (Laws, c. 10, § 22) made the license fee $30, reduced to $20 at the adjourned session; licenses to be granted by Sheriffs. (Id., p. 64.) Sellers by the quart and upward, not to be drunk on the premises, were exempted from retail license. (Laws, 1846, c. 91.)

The retail license was placed at $200 by the Laws of 1853, c. 513. And by the Laws of 1858, c. 994, the penalty for selling without license was $50 to $500. The license was reduced to $100 by the Laws of 1859, c. 1008.

And sellers by the quart or over might allow the liquor to be drunk on the premises. (Laws, 1859, c. 1008.) Distilleries were prohibited, and required to be abated as nuisances by the Governor, except those distilling liquor for use in the Confederate Army and for medicinal purposes; penalty, $1.000 to $5,000, or imprisonment three to 12 months, or both. (Laws, 1862, c. 1382.) By the laws of 1863, c. 1423, such distillation was prohibited under the higher penalty of $10,000 and imprisonment, but distillation from fruits of the country was allowed.

Retail licenses were charged $200 by the Revenue act of 1865, c. 1501, § 6, reduced to $50 by Laws of 1868, c. 1713, § 3, and raised to $100 by Laws of 1872, c. 1887, § 1. Selling without license was fined double the required fee. In 1881 the license was made $300, though only $25 was charged for selling beer and wine exclusively ; distillers were charged $300. (Laws, 1881, c. 3219, § 10.) In 1887 (Laws, c. 3681) the whiskey-retailer's license was raised to $400, and the beer and wine license was abandoned.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—The Revenue law of 1889 (Laws, c. 3847, § 1) enacts that no person shall engage in a business requiring license without a State license. Counties, cities and towns may impose additional license, equal to half the State license. Licenses shall be for one year, or a fractional part thereof, expiring Oct. 1, and may be transferred with the approval of the Comptroller. (Id.) Dealers in spirituous wines and malt liquors shall pay $400, and distillers $100, for each place of business. No license is required for distilling from the products of the vines or fruit-trees of the State, and no license shall be granted in Prohibition districts. Makers of domestic wines are permitted to sell in quantities of one quart or more, and druggists are allowed to sell mixtures made officinal by the United States Dispensatory without license. Liquor-dealers on boats shall only need to take out license in the county where they do their principal business, and at landings can sell to no one but passengers and crew. Selling without license is fined double the amount of the required license tax. (Laws, 1883, c. 3413, § 12.)

Applications to the County Commissioners for license to sell liquor shall be signed by a majority of the registered voters of the election district in the presence of two credible witnesses, and contain the oath of the applicant that each signature is genuine. The petition is to be published in full, in a paper published in the county, for two weeks preceding a hearing thereon, at the expense of the applicant. (Laws, 1883, c. 3416, § 2.) No Collector shall issue a license without permit of the County Commissioners, and the license shall provide that it may, by them, be revoked for violations of this act. (Id., § 3.)

No person shall sell liquor to any minor or person intoxicated. (Id., § 4) The County Commissioners, upon the affidavit of two reliable citizens that such sales have been made by any dealer, may suspend his license. (Id., § 5.) Such affidavit shall be made before the Clerk of the County Court, who shall notify the dealer to appear at the next regular meeting of the Board, when the Commissioners shall, if the charge is sustained, revoke the license. (Id , § 6.) Any person or firm that shall give or by pretended sale of a different article shall furnish liquor, to entice custom or evade the law, shall be deemed selling without license. (Id., § 7.) Bar rooms shall be closed on days of election. Sales or gifts of liquor within two miles of any election precinct, on such days, shall be punished by imprisonment not longer than six months, or by fine of not exceeding $500. (Laws, 1883, c. 3457.)

The Board of County Commissioners of each county in the State, not oftener than once in every two years, upon application of one-fourth of the registered voters, shall call and provide for an election to decide whether the sale of intoxicating liquors, wines or beer, shall be prohibited in the county, the question to be determined by majority vote; which election shall be conducted in the manner of general elections —provided that intoxicating liquors shall not be sold in any election district in which a majority vote has been cast against the same at the said election. Elections under this section shall be held within 60 days from the time of presenting said application, except if any election so ordered shall thereby fall within 60 days of any State or national election, it must be held within 60 days after any such election. The Legislature shall provide necessary laws to carry out and enforce the provisions of this article. (Const., 1885, Art. 19, §§ 1, 2.) Upon such application, the Clerk of the Board of Commissioners shall give 30 days' notice of the election by publishing in a paper in each town, or if there is no newspaper in the county, by posting in ten places. The Clerk of the County Court shall appoint registration officers who shall register voters for such election. (Laws, 1887, c 3700, § 1.) If any county votes for license, such shall be granted as provided by law, but liquors shall not be sold in any precinct voting against license. (Id.) Penalty for violating this law is placed at not exceeding $500 fine, or imprisonment not longer than six months, or both. (Id., § 3.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by three-fifths of all the members of the two Houses, at one session; the popular vote to be taken at the next general election for Representatives, three months' notice to be given. A majority carries it.

Georgia.

Oglethorpe's Prohibition of Rum (1733–42).—The second day after the arrival of James Oglethorpe with his colonists in Georgia (February, 1733), in an address to them regarding their duties, he said that "the importation of ardent spirits was illegal." This announcement, however, was made on his own responsibility, and did not have formal legal effect until the policy was approved in London (November, 1733) by "the Trustees for establishing the Colony of Georgia in America." In a letter to Oglethorpe, dated Nov. 22, 1733, the Trustees said : "As it appears evidently by your letters that the sickness among the people is owing to the excessive drinking of rum punch, the Trustees do absolutely forbid their drinking, or even having any rum, and agree with you so entirely in your sentiments that they order all that shall be brought there to be immediately staved. As the Trustees are apprehensive all their orders to this purpose may be ineffectual while the trading-house is so near and can supply the people, they are of opinion that the trading-house shall not be permitted. but on condition that they offer no rum for sale, nor indeed keep any." Parliament accordingly passed an act prohibiting "the importation of rum and brandies" into Georgia, which was read at a meeting of the Trustees on April 23, 1735. This prohibition was warmly supported by the influence of Wesley, Whitfield and others; but, giving rise to dissensions among the colonists, and being neutralized to a considerable extent by the contrary policy of the neighboring colony of South Carolina as well as by illicit traffic, it was rescinded by act of Parliament in 1742.[1]

Later Colonial Provisions.—After the repeal of the Rum act, the magistrates of the colony were authorized to grant licenses, "under proper restrictions and regulations," for the selling of rum. In 1752 the governing power was taken out of the hands of the Trustees, in 1754 the first Royal Governor arrived, and in January, 1755, the first General Assembly of Georgia met. Only two months later (March, 1755) this General Assembly passed an act forbidding the selling or giving of "any beer or spirituous liquor whatsoever" to any slave without the owner's consent, under penalty of 20*s* fine for the first offense and 40*s* for the second, with recognizance in £20 not to offend for one year —the accused to be committed to prison without bail for a period not exceeding three months in case he should be unable to present suitable bondsmen.

The thirtieth legislative act, passed in 1757, was "for regulating taverns and punch-houses and retailers of spirituous liquors," the preamble to it declaring: "The measures hitherto taken to prevent unfit persons from obtaining licenses to keep taverns, punch-houses and retailing of strong liquors have proved ineffectual, and the increase of tippling-houses are become hurtful and prejudicial to the common good and welfare of this His Majesty's Province. but more especially the little tippling-houses which are for the most part haunts for lewd, idle and disorderly people, runaway sailors, servants and slaves." It provided that from Oct. 1, 1757, no person should sell any intoxicating drink in less quantity than three gallons at one time to any one person without obtaining a license from the Treasurer, under penalty of £3 for each offense (half to the informer); the annual license fee to be £3 in Savannah, 40*s* in Augusta and Ebenezer and 20*s* elsewhere; each licensee to execute a bond in £20 not to sell to negroes or Indians. Any unlicensed person selling to Indians was fined £5. A curious provision of this act was that no liquor license should be granted to any joiner. bricklayer, plasterer, shipwright, silver or goldsmith, shoemaker, smith, tailor, tanner, cabinet maker or cooper, who should "be able and capable by his or their honest labour and industry of getting a livelihood and maintaining himself and family by exercising any of the trades aforesaid."

An act (No. 55) for the better regulation of drinking-places was passed in 1759.

No person keeping a public house of entertainment was to suffer any persons, except strangers or lodgers, in his house, or to allow them to remain drinking, or in any manner idly spending their time Sundays, on penalty of 5*s* for the person so entertaining as well as for the one entertained. (Dig. Ga., Phila. 1801, p. 80 [1762].) Liquor-sellers suffering any apprentices, overseers, journeymen. laborers or servants to game in their houses, were fined 40*s*; and any person so gaming there 10*s*. (Id., p. 96 [1764].) Patrols might enter tippling-houses to correct slaves found there. (Id., p. 123 [1765].)

Another act regulating taverns was passed in 1765 (No. 127), another, explaining and amending, in 1766 (No. 146) and another in 1767. Tippling-house-keepers were not to sell sailors over 1*s* 6*d* worth of liquor in any one day, or permit them to tipple or drink after 9 o'clock, unless by consent of the master of the vessel, under penalty of 20*s*. (Id., p. 131 [1766].) Persons selling or giving liquor to slaves, without consent of owners, were fined £5; for the second offence £10, with recognizance in £20 not to offend again for a year. (Id., p. 174 [1770].) In 1777, suffering gaming, by licensed tavern-keepers, was fined £20. (Id., p. 201.)

Early State Laws.—An act to enforce the collection of arrearages due from persons keeping taverns, etc, and to amend former acts regulating them, was passed in 1777. (No. 459.) Another act regulating taverns was passed in 1786 (No. 353),—an act regulating taverns and reducing the rates of tavern license, requiring applicants to petition the Justices of the inferior Court of the county who at discretion granted the license if the place was convenient and petitioner had sufficient accommodations for travelers, upon bond in £50 to keep an orderly house. Selling without license was fined £10; but merchants, makers and distillers might sell in quantities of a quart or over, not to be drunk on the premises, except that merchants might not sell less than a gallon in Chatham, Liberty or Eppingham Counties. The license fee was made $2. In 1791 Savannah and Augusta were given sole power to regulate taverns and licenses. (Id., p. 453.)

The act of 1809 (Laws, p. 78) made the license fee $5, and provided that persons might have license to retail liquors without being obliged to keep places of public entertainment, provided such persons gave bonds in $500 to keep orderly houses.

---

[1] These particulars are obtained from Prof. H. A. Scomp's "King Alcohol in the Realm of King Cotton." Summing up his account of this early experiment, Prof. Scomp says (p. 112):

"For nearly nine years Prohibition of the rum traffic was of legal force in Georgia. While Oglethorpe remained in Savannah, the Prohibition, as we have seen, was faithfully enforced; but when war and other causes had separated him from the little metropolis, the execution of the laws was committed to weaker hands, to men most of whom were themselves violators of the statutes they were sworn to defend. Then the temptations of the Indian trade, the influence of the Carolinians, the allurements and the commerce with the West Indies and the Northern Colonies, all flowing with rum, the confusion of wars and the corrupting presence of an immoral soldiery—all these causes operated to the demoralization of the people and the final abrogation of the law."

The First Grant of Local Option.—By the Laws of 1833, p. 125, the inferior Court was permitted to grant or withhold licenses at discretion in Camden and Liberty Counties.

Keeping a tippling-shop, or retailing liquor without license, was punished by fine of $50. This was to correct the wording of the Penal Code, § 27, 10th Division, which was so worded as not to apply to cities. (Laws, 1853, No. 73.)

Liquor licenses having in some counties been given to free persons of color, or to persons acting as their guardians, thereby evading the law, selling by such persons was forbidden, even when acting as agents for whites, upon penalty of $100 in case of a white, or 39 lashes in case of the free person of color. Sales by such persons of color to slaves were punished by 39 lashes and $50 for the first offense, and 50 lashes and $100 for second offense; and if the fine were not paid the offender might be sold for time enough to produce it. (Laws, 1853, No. 75.) By Laws of 1858, No. 164, the price of license in Wilson County was made $100. By No. 165 the Grand Juries in four counties might fix the license fee each year. By No. 167 the inferior Court of another county was given power to grant or refuse licenses, and to demand as much for those granted as they chose. By Laws of 1859, No. 341, peddling liquor was prohibited in 32 named counties, and by No 288 a petition of a majority of the voters within three miles was required for a license. Selling liquor to slaves and free persons of color was for the first offense punished by fine $50 to $200 and imprisonment 10 to 30 days. (Laws, 1859, No. 78.) Peddling liquors in 19 counties was prohibited by Laws of 1860, No. 219.

War Provisions.—Distillation of corn or grain, except for medicinal and similar other purposes, was prohibited upon penalty of $2,000 to $5,000 and imprisonment not over 12 months; and no grain was to be exported for distillation, except that whiskey might, under restriction, be allowed to be distilled for the Confederate Government. (Laws, 1862, Nos. 19 and 20.) These acts were repealed in 1865. (Laws, No. 110.)

Since the War.—The oath to be taken by retail dealers not to sell to minors, either white or colored, without consent of parent, was so amended by Laws of 1866, No. 17. Selling liquor on election days within one mile of city, town or precinct where elections might be held, was fined not over $50, with alternative imprisonment not exceeding 10 days, or both. (Laws, 1869, No. 132.) By Laws of 1871, No. 221, liquor-selling was prohibited within one mile of Clement's Institute, and one such law was passed the next year. By Laws of 1872, No. 22, gaming in saloons was prohibited. This was made to apply only to minors, by Laws of 1873, No. 43. In 1873, five local liquor laws were passed affecting six counties and three other places. They prohibited the sale, or required a license to be recommended by a majority or more of the residents of the vicinity of the saloon. Such laws now increased in number every year, and to indicate them, even by count, would be tedious.

Selling to minors was prohibited by Laws of 1875, No. 113, and to drunken persons by No. 12, the last being an amendment to apply to sellers whether licensed or not. Sale to minors was allowed on written consent of parent or guardian by Laws of 1877, No. 109. Domestic wines were exempted from the license laws by Laws of 1877, No. 32. And in the General Tax act of that year (No. 123, § 4) liquor-dealers were taxed $25, excepting those selling not less than five-gallon quantities of spirits, produced by themselves of fruits grown by them.

There has been no other change in Georgia's liquor laws until, out of the local Prohibitions and regulations, there grew the General Local Option act which is now in force.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—A special tax on the sale of spirituous and malt liquors, which the General Assembly is hereby authorized to assess, is hereby set apart and devoted for the support of common schools. (Const., art. 8, § 3; Code, 1882, § 5206.) Dealers in spirituous and malt liquors and intoxicating bitters are taxed $25. (Code, 1882, § 809 a.) They must annually go before the Ordinary and register, and then the Ordinary must notify the Comptroller of the State and the Tax Collector of the county. And the Comptroller must keep a book as a register of liquor-dealers. And the Collector, when so notified, must enter the name in a county register of liquor-dealers. After registering, the dealer must pay to the Tax Collector his tax. On his failing so to register and pay, he is punished as in Code, § 4310, by fine of not over $1,000, imprisonment not over six months, or chain-gang not over 12 months, or all combined. (Id., §§ 809 b–k; see Laws, 1882, c. 277.) This does not relieve the dealer of the United States or local taxes. (Id., § 809 l.) The Ordinary and Tax Collector must lay their registers before the Grand Juries at their fall meetings. (Id., 809 m.) Except in incorporated towns and cities, application for license must be made to the Ordinary of the county, consented to by ten of the nearest residents (five of whom must be freeholders owning land nearest the place of business). Bond in $500 must be executed to keep an orderly house and observe the oath taken not to sell to minors without consent of parent or guardian. (Code, 1882, § 1419, amended 1884, c. 422.) Vendors of less than one gallon, not taking such oath by the 1st of June of each year, are subject to penalty for selling without license (Code, 1882, § 1420.) Licenses only authorize sales in one place. (Id., § 1421.) Corporate towns and cities must charge as much for licenses, at least, as is required in the county. (Id., § 1422.) Sellers must not furnish liquors to one who is drunk, under penalty of selling without license. (Id., § 1423.) A dealer furnishing liquor to a habitual drunkard, known to him, or of whose habits he has been notified in writing by wife, father, mother, brother or sister, is guilty of a misdemeanor. (Laws, 1882, c. 351.) Sale of liquors in quantities less than one quart makes the seller a retailer. (Code, 1882, § 1424.)

Selling to minors without written authority of parent or guardian is punished as in Code, § 4310 (Id., § 4540 a), and so is employing minors in barrooms. (Id., 4540 c.)

Keeping a tippling-shop or selling liquor without a license, is punished under § 4310 of the Code. (Id., § 4565.)

Persons who manufacture wine from the grapes of a vineyard in the State may freely sell the same in quantities not less than one quart. (Id., § 4565 a.) But where, under the General Local Option law or any other local or general law, the sale of liquor has been or may be prohibited, but with exceptions in relation to any kinds of wines, a tax of $10,000 shall be annually levied on every dealer in domestic wines or other intoxicants not prohibited as aforesaid, except dealers in or producers of wines made from grapes or berries raised or purchased by them. (Laws, 1887, No. 168.)

The General Assembly shall by law forbid the sale, distribution or furnishing of intoxicating drinks within two miles of election precincts on days of election—State, county or municipal,—and prescribe punishment for any violation of the same. (Const., art. 2, § 5; Code, 1882, § 5037.) In pursuance of this provision, § 4570 of the Code of 1882 was enacted (amended in 1887 by Laws, No. 376), prohibiting any person to furnish liquor to any one within two miles of any election precinct on days of election, either State, county, municipal or primary, under penalty of § 4310 of the Code. This is not to operate against physicians' prescriptions.

Selling within a mile of any church not in an incorporated town or city, during worship, or of any camp-ground, during worship, without consent of the trustees of such ground, is prohibited under penalty of Code. § 4310. (Id., §§ 4575-6-7.) Carrying liquor, except for medicinal or sacramental purposes, to any place where people are assembled for worship, or Sunday-school, or Sunday-school celebration, or day-school celebration, shall be so punished. (Id., § 4577 b.) Pursuing business on Sunday is prohibited under same penalty. (Id., § 4579.) Selling adulterated liquor is prohibited under same penalty. (Id., § 4551.)

The Laws of 1857 (being §§ 1580-7 of the Code of 1882) provide for Inspectors of liquors, spirits and wines, monthly inspections or upon call, and penalties for selling drugged liquors, or evading inspection, or selling without inspection, where an Inspector has been appointed.

Upon petition to the County Ordinary by one-tenth of the qualified voters, an election shall be ordered by him, within 60 days, but not for any month of a general election. (Laws, 1884, No. 182, § 1.) Notice of such election shall be published four weeks in the official organ, and it shall be conducted as general elections. (Id., § 2.) Ballots shall be "For the Sale" or "Against the Sale." (Id., § 2.) One list of voters and tally-sheet shall be delivered the Ordinary, who shall consolidate the returns and declare the result, when the act goes into effect, after a further notice of four weeks in the same papers of the vote "Against the Sale." Contests of the result may be made in the Superior Court by petition of one-tenth of the voters, such contest not to be a *supersedeas* of the result. (Id., § 4.) No other election shall be held for two years hereunder. (Id., § 5.) The law against selling at elections applies to these elections. (Id., § 7.) Nothing in this act shall prevent the manufacture, sale or use of domestic wines or cider, or the use of wine in the sacrament, provided such wines or cider are not sold in barrooms, by retail; nor shall druggists be prohibited selling pure alcohol for medicinal, art, scientific or mechanical purposes. (Id., § 8.) No election hereunder shall be held for any county, city, town or place where by law the sale is now prohibited by local legislation. (Id., § 9.) After vote against the sale, selling, bartering or giving away liquor is prohibited, in the county, under penalty of Code, § 4310. (Id., § 10.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by vote of two-thirds of all the members of the two Houses, at one session; popular vote to be taken at the next general election for Representatives, two months' notice to be given. A majority carries it.

Idaho Territory.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—The license clauses in the Revenue law of the first session of the Legislature (1863) were still in force in 1889, except that the procedure for granting licenses has been somewhat elaborated, piecemeal, in succeeding Revenue laws. These are mere official regulations to insure the revenue, and not affecting the licenses.

Retail liquor licenses, procured of the Tax Collector, are charged $50 per quarter, or $25 within the limits of Boise City, or $15 for persons retailing liquors in connection with the entertainment of travelers at any point one mile or more outside any city or town. (R. S., 1887, § 1648.) Merchants selling wines or distilled liquors or goods, etc., pay $1 to $25 per month, according to volume of business, in ten classes. Sales of liquors not to be in less quantity than a quart. (Id., §§ 1649-50.)

Selling liquor to Indians is a misdemeanor by act of 1863. (R. S., 1887, § 6929.) Persons adulterating liquor or selling the same so adulterated, are guilty of a misdemeanor. (Id., § 6918.) Carrying on business without license is a misdemeanor. (Id., § 6983.) Keeping open saloons and selling liquor Sunday was forbidden, under penalty of $15 to $50, by Laws of 1872, p. 86. Sales by retail of liquor were made invalid considerations for any promise to pay in excess of $10, and Courts were not to give judgment on account thereof in excess of that sum. (Laws, 1870, p. 75.)

[Idaho's admission as a State was provided for by act of Congress in 1890.]

Illinois.

Earliest Provisions.—At the beginning of organized government in Illinois, it was provided that "for preventing disorders and the mischiefs that may happen from a multiplicity of public houses" no person was to keep such, until he obtained permission of the County Commissioners, upon penalty of $1 per day (one-third to the informer). And he should suffer no drunkenness, disorder or gaming, under the same penalty. The license fee was to be fixed by the Commissoners, at not exceeding $12; and a bond (in not exceeding $300) to obey the law was required. Unlicensed persons were fined $12 for selling. Selling to and harboring minors and servants after being warned not to do so, was fined $3, and for the third offense license was forfeited and the licensee rendered forever incapable of being licensed again. Selling to slaves was fined $3; for subsequent offenses, $4. (R. L., 1833, p. 595; passed in 1819.) Selling to Indians was fined $20. Debts for liquor at retail of over 50 cents were made void, and no licenses were to be granted those who had not tavern accommodations for four persons. (Laws, 1823, p. 148.)

The Laws of 1835 (p. 154) provided that the license rate was to be not exceeding $50, taking into consideration the place where the tavern was located. Any one was authorized to sell cider and beer as he might think proper. (Laws, 1837, p. 326.)

Earliest Local Option (1839).—Soon these laws were all repealed, and the license fee was placed at $25 to $300, the Commissioners to grant and reject at discretion, and revoke licenses on being satisfied the law had been violated. In incorporated towns the authorities were given the exclusive privilege of granting licenses. And if a majority of the voters in any county, justice's district, incorporated town or ward in a city should petition against licenses therein, none should be granted until a like petition in favor of licenses should be filed. (Laws, 1839, p. 71.)

A grocery was defined to be any house or place where spirituous or vinous liquor was sold in quantities less than a quart, and persons without license to keep a grocery, so selling, were to be fined $10. (Laws, 1841, p. 178.)

Short-lived Prohibition (1851-3).—All retailing of liquor to be drunk on the premises was prohibited and fined $25, excepting by druggists or physicians for medical, mechanical or sacramental purposes. And all acts authorizing licenses to be granted were repealed by Laws of 1851, p. 18.

The act of 1853, p. 91, declared re-enacted all laws in force at the time of the above-mentioned act, except that license fees should be $50 to $300. The Laws of 1871, p. 552, declared unlawful saloons to be nuisances, and provided for civil damages. This provision is virtually re-enacted in the Revised Statutes now in force.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—The General Assembly has power to tax liquor-dealers by general law. (Const., art. 9, § 1.)

A dramshop is a place where spirituous, vinous or malt liquors are retailed in less quantity than one gallon. (R. S., 1887, c. 43, § 1.) Selling liquor, without license to keep a dramshop, to be drunk on the premises, is punished by fine of $20 to $100, or by imprisonment 10 to 30 days, or both. (Id., § 2.)

The County Boards may grant licenses to as many as they judge the public good requires, upon application by petition of a majority of the legal voters of the town or election precinct, upon payment of not less than $500, provided a license for sale of malt liquors only may be granted for $150, and provided such Board shall not have power to issue any license to keep a dramshop in any incorporated city, town or village, or within two miles of the same, in which the corporate authorities have the authority to grant the same, or in any place in which sale of liquor is prohibited by law. (Id., § 17, amending § 3.) The corporate authorities of any city, town or village cannot grant licenses for less than $500, or $150 for malt liquors only provided that City Councils, Town Boards of Trustees and the President and Board of Trustees of villages may grant permits to pharmacists for the sale of liquor for medicinal, mechanical, sacramental and chemical purposes only, under such restrictions as may be provided by ordinance. (Id., § 16.) Each license shall state the time for which it is granted, not to exceed one year. The place of the dramshop shall not be transferable, nor shall more than one place be kept under any license. Any license may be revoked by the County Board whenever satisfied the licensee has violated the law, or that he keeps a disorderly house or allows illegal gaming. (Id., § 4.) No person shall be licensed without giving a bond in $3,000, conditioned that he will pay all persons all damages they may sustain, either in person or property or means of support, by reason of sales under such license. Such bond may be sued by any person so injured, or his representatives. (Id., § 5.)

Giving or selling liquor to any minor, without written order of the parent, guardian or physician, to any person intoxicated or in the habit of getting so, is punished by fine of $20 to $100 or imprisonment 10 to 30 days, or both. (Id., § 6.)

All places where liquors are sold in violation of law are common nuisances, and whoever shall keep such a place shall be fined $50 to $100, and imprisoned 20 to 50 days; and it shall be a part of the judgment that the place so kept be shut up and abated until the keeper give bond in $1,000 not to sell unlawfully. (Id., § 7.)

Every person, with or without license, who shall by sale of liquors cause the intoxication of any person, shall be chargeable for a reasonable compensation, and $2 per day beside, to anyone taking care of such intoxicated person. (Id., § 8.)

Every husband wife, child, parent, guardian, employer or other person, who shall be injured in person, property or means of support by any intoxicated person or in consequence of the intoxication, habitual or otherwise, of any person, shall have action, severally or jointly, against any person or persons who have by selling liquor caused such intoxication, in whole or in part; and any person owning, renting or permitting the occupation of any premises, with knowledge that liquor is sold therein, shall be so liable, severally or jointly, with the person selling, and for exemplary damages. The unlawful sale of liquor thereon shall make void all leases of the premises leased. (Id., § 9.) For the payment of damages under the above section, the real estate of the defendant is liable, and the real estate upon which the liquor was sold with the knowledge of the owner; but if such last real estate belong to a minor, his guardian shall be held liable instead of the ward. (Id., § 10.) Actions for damages for less than $200 under this law may be brought before a Justice of the Peace. (Id., § 11.)

Any fine or imprisonment in this act may be enforced by indictment; and in case of conviction the offender shall stand committed until the judgment is fully paid. (Id., § 12.) Giving away liquor, or other shifts or devices to evade the law, constitute unlawful selling. (Id., § 13.) In all prosecutions, it is not necessary to state the kind of liquor sold, or to describe the place where sold, or to show the knowledge of the principal, in order to convict for the acts of his agent; and the persons to whom the liquor was sold are competent witnesses. (Id., § 14.) It is no objection to a recovery that the defendant is punishable under any city, village or town ordinance. (Id., § 15.) A person licensed to sell malt liquors only, selling other liquors, shall be fined $20 to $100 or imprisoned 10 to 30 days, or both, and forfeit his license. (Id., § 18.) Whoever shall sell liquor in less quantities than four gallons, outside the incorporated limits of any city, town or village, shall be fined $50 to $100, or be imprisoned 30 to 90 days, or both. (Id., § 19.) This shall not be construed to prevent County Boards from granting license to keep dramshops as now provided by law, and all persons so licensed shall be exempt from the provisions of the last above section. (Id., § 23.)

The City Council in cities, and the President and Board of Trustees in villages, have the power to license, regulate and prohibit the selling of liquor therein, and may grant permits to druggists to sell for medicinal and similar purposes only, conforming to the general law when granting licenses. (R. S., 1887, c. 24, § 62, p. 46.) And they may forbid and punish selling to minors, apprentices or servants, or insane, idiotic or distracted persons, or habitual drunkards, or persons intoxicated. (Id., p. 48.)

Adulteration of liquor, or selling such adulterated liquor, is punished by fine not over $1,000, or imprisonment not over one year, or both. (Id., c. 38, § 8.)

Any intoxicated person found in any public place or disturbing the public peace or that of his own family, in any private building or place, shall be fined not exceeding $5, or $25 for any subsequent offense—prosecutions to be begun within 30 days. (Id., § 64.)

Selling liquor within one mile of a camp or field-meeting, during the time of holding the meeting, without consent of the authorities of the meeting, is fined not exceeding $100, provided that no one is required to suspend his regular business. (Id., § 59.) Keeping a tippling-shop open on Sunday is fined not exceeding $200 (Id., § 259.) Furnishing liquors to prisoners is punished by fine of not exceeding $50, or 30 days' imprisonment, or both. (Id., § 210.) Sheriffs and jailers shall not permit prisoners to send for, or have liquor, except upon physician's prescription. (Id., c. 75, § 18.) Selling liquor within two miles of fair-grounds shall be fined $100 to $500, but no regular business is affected. (Id., c. 5, §§ 12, 13.) Opening a saloon or selling liquor within one mile of the place of holding any election is prohibited, upon penalty of $25 to $100; and it shall be the duty of officers and magistrates to see that this is enforced. (Id., c. 46, § 79.)

There is a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. (Laws, 1889, p. 345)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by two-thirds of all the members of the two Houses, at one session; popular vote to be taken at the next general election for Representatives, three months' notice to be given. A majority carries it.

Indiana.

Early Provisions.—The Governor was empowered to prohibit the sale of liquor within 30 miles of any council with the Indians; penalty, $50 to $500. (Laws, 1805, c. 1) A prohibition against selling liquor to Indians was enacted, conditioned on similar laws being passed by Kentucky, Ohio, Louisiana and Michigan. (Id., c. 7.) The Courts of Common Pleas were empowered to grant licenses for not exceeding $12. (Id., c. 18.) Selling liquor to Indians within 40 miles of Vincennes was prohibited in 1806. (Laws, c. 27)

Chapter 17 of the Laws of 1807 was the same as was subsequently (1819) passed in Illinois. It provided that the Court should issue licenses upon bond in not exceeding $300 to obey the law. The Laws of 1816, c. 17, § 7, provided that tavern license fees were to be paid to the County Treasurer. The County Commissoners were entrusted with the right to grant licenses, each applicant presenting a certificate of 12 householders that he was a person of good moral character and that the place would be for the convenience of travelers, and giving bond in $500 not to permit disorder or gaming, or to sell on Sunday, or unlawfully. Selling to minors and intoxicated persons was fined $3, as was selling without license. (Laws, 1817, c. 48.) In 1819 (Laws, c. 36) the Circuit Courts were given the authority to license and tavern accommodations were required. By Laws of 1824, c. 107, the licensing power was again vested in the County Commissioners. The Circuit Court was to suppress the license or abate the tavern upon violation of law. And there was a general fine, not to exceed $50, for violating the act. Twenty-four signers to the applicant's certificate were required. (Laws, 1825, c. 71) By Laws of 1828, c. 63, the County Court was authorized to grant licenses to retail to those who did not keep taverns, on the same conditions otherwise required.

Earliest Local Option (1832).—The laws were consolidated in 1832 (Laws, c. 170), with the added provision that licenses to retail only should not be granted in any town or township where the majority of the freeholders remonstrated against granting the same.

All tippling-houses or places where intoxicating liquors were sold without license, and drunk in and about the same, if kept in a disorderly manner, were nuisances, and the keepers might be fined $25 to $100. (Laws, 1840, c. 85.) Licenses to retail liquors were fixed at $25 to $200, provided that a majority of the citizens, householders of any town or township, might remonstrate, in writing, against granting licenses therein, and the County Board would be governed thereby. (Laws, 1840, c. 5, §§ 16, 17) This was repealed as to three counties by Laws of 1842, c. 125. License was not to be granted in any township in Carroll and Cass Counties unless, at the next annual town elections, the majority voted therefor. (Laws, 1841, c. 152.) Licenses in 12 counties were not to be granted, except upon petition of a majority of the legal voters of the township. And the license fee was to be determined by the Board in 16 other counties. (Laws, 1842, c. 119.)

Three laws making the obtainment of licenses easier in seven counties were passed at the 1843 session, and one prohibiting sales in a township.

It was made lawful for the voters of the several townships, at their annual spring elections, to vote against the granting of licenses to retail liquors therein. (Laws, 1847, c. 7.) In 1849 '50 and '51, many laws were passed modifying the general law, one way or the other, in certain specified counties and townships. In 1853 (Laws, c. 66) the last above-mentioned provision for Local Option was re-enacted, with strict nuisance and civil damage features, and providing for a bond of $2,000, and prohibiting sales on Sunday.

Prohibition's Brief Reign (1855-8.)—A Prohibitory or Maine law was passed in 1855 (Laws, c. 105); and by c 106 the former law was repealed, so far as it granted licenses, and such licenses granted thereunder were made void after a certain date. Under the Prohibitory law, the penalty for manufacturing was $20 to $50 for the first offense, $50 to $100 for the second, and $100 for each subsequent one—a penalty of 30 days' imprisonment to be added for each offense after the first. Penalties for selling were the same, except that for selling to minors the fine was not less than $50. Every device or contrivance to deal out or sell liquor and conceal the person selling it was declared a nuisance, to be abated under fine of $50 to $100 and imprisonment 30 to 90 days. The Prohibitory law was repealed in 1858 (Laws, c 15), after having been declared unconstitutional generally. (Beebe v. State, 6 Ind. 501; Herman v. State, 8 Ind. 545; O. Daily v. State, 9 Ind 494; 10 Ind. 26, 572.)

C. 130 of Laws of 1859 was a license law requiring $50 license fee, prohibiting sales on Sunday and election days, to minors and to habitual drunkards after notice, with penalty for selling without license of $5 to $100, to which imprisonment might be added, not exceeding 30 days. This was amended by giving a remonstrant against granting a license right to appeal. (Laws. 1861, c. 72.) Another amendment was made by Laws of 1865, c 96, which added a penalty of $10 to $50 for selling Sundays or election days, the original law having no penalty attached to it C. 59 of Laws of 1873 was a stricter license law, requiring a petition for license to be signed by a majority of the voters in the townships or wards, and a bond of $3 000, with penalty of forfeiture of license for violation of the act, and providing that no violator should be qualified to receive another license for five years. Full civil damage provisions were added, as were also the usual prohibitions. No fee for license, or permit to sell, as it was called, was required, beyond the cost involved in procuring it.

The act of 1875, c. 13, repealed all former laws relating to liquors, and now remains in force.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—It is unlawful to sell, barter or give away any spirituous, vinous or malt liquor, in quantities less than a quart, without first procuring a license of the Board of Commissioners of the county. (R S., 1888, § 5312.) "Intoxicating liquor" applies to any spirituous, vinous or malt liquor. (Id., § 5313.) Any one desiring a license shall give notice in a paper published in the county, or if there is none, by posting in three places, at least 20 days before the meeting of the Board, stating the precise location of his premises and the kinds of liquor he desires to sell. And any voter of the township may remonstrate against such license on account of immorality or other unfitness of the applicant. (Id., § 5314.) The Board shall grant a license upon the giving of bond in $2,000, conditioned that the applicant will keep an orderly house and pay all fines and costs and all judgments for civil damages against him, if such applicant is a fit person to be intrusted with the sale of liquor, and if he be not in the habit of becoming intoxicated. No appeal from the order of the Board shall operate to estop the applicant from receiving license and selling thereunder until the close of the next term of the Court in which it might be lawfully tried. (Id., § 5315.)

The license fee to sell all liquors is $100; to sell vinous or malt, or both, $50—such fees to go to the school fund of the county. (Id., § 5316.) No city shall charge more than $250 more, and no incorporated town more than $150 more, than the above fees. (Id., § 5317; amended by Laws of 1889, c. 218.)

License shall be issued by the County Auditor upon the order of the Board granting the license and the receipt of the County Treasurer for the fee. It shall specify the name of the applicant, the place of sale and time to run, and permit liquors sold to be drunk on the premises. (R. S., 1888, § 5318.) No license shall be for more or less than a year. (Id., § 5319.)

Persons not licensed, selling to be drunk on the premises, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and fined $20 to $100, and the Court may add imprisonment for 10 to 30 days. (Id., § 5320.) Criminal and Circuit Courts have jurisdiction under this act. (Id., § 5321.) And Justices of the Peace have jurisdiction to try and determine all cases under this act, provided that if the Justice think a fine of $25 is inadequate in any case, he is to recognize the party to the Criminal or Circuit Court. (Id., § 5322.) Every person who shall sell liquor in violation of this act shall be personally liable, and also liable on his bond, to any person who shall sustain any injury or damage to his person or property on account of the use of such liquors so sold. (Id., § 5323.) Cities may regulate and license all inns, taverns and shops where liquor is sold to be used upon the premises. (R. S., 1888, § 3106, c. 13.) To exact license money from persons selling liquor, cities have jurisdiction two miles beyond the city limits. (Id., § 3154.)

Adulterating native wine and selling such is fined $10 to $100 (Id., § 2072), and the same penalty is charged for so adulterating liquors. (Id., § 2073.) Using active poison in intoxicating liquors is punished by imprisonment one to seven years, and fine not exceeding $500. (Id., § 2074.)

Whoever is found drunk in any public place is fined not exceeding $5; for the second conviction not exceeding $25, and for third not over $100, and he may be imprisoned five to 30 days and disfranchised for any determinate period. (Id., § 2091.) Selling liquor to a drunken man knowingly is fined $10 to $100, to which may be added imprisonment for 30 days to one year, and disfranchisement for any determinate period. (Id., § 2092.) Selling to a habitual drunkard, after notice in writing by any citizen of the township, is fined $50 to $100, to which may be added imprisonment 30 days to one year and disfranchisement any determinate period. (Id., § 2093.) Selling to a minor is fined $20 to $100. (Id., § 2094.) Any minor over 14 years of age misrepresenting his age as being over 21 to procure liquor, is fined $10 to $100. (Id., § 2095.) Furnishing liquor to prisoners, or keepers permitting them to have such liquor, except the same is prescribed by a physician, is fined $20 to $100. (Id., § 2096.) Keeping a disorderly liquor-shop is fined $10 to $100. (Id., § 2097.) Selling liquor on Sunday, or any legal holiday or upon election day, or between the hours of 11 P. M. and 5 A. M., is fined $10 to $50, to which may be added imprisonment for 10 to 60 days. (Id., § 2098.) Druggists selling on such days or nights, except upon physicians' prescriptions, are so punished. (Id., § 2099.) Selling liquor within one mile of an assemblage for religious worship, or any agricultural fair or exhibition, without authority of the managers of such meeting or fair, shall be punished by fine of $10 to $50 and imprisonment for 10 days. But this does not apply to regular business. (Id., § 2100.)

The State Board of Health shall, in its annual report, state what, in its best judgment, is the effect of the use of liquors upon the industry, health and lives of the people. (Id., § 4987.)

Appeals, upon the granting of a license or its refusal, shall be to the Circuit Court within 10 days, upon bond to pay côsts and not without. (Laws, 1889, c. 148.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by a majority of the members of the two Houses, must be concurred in by a majority of the members of each House in the next Legislature, and to be adopted must be approved by a majority of the electors voting on the question at the polls.

Indian Territory.

Cherokee Nation.—The introduction and vending of ardent spirits in this Nation shall be unlawful, under penalty of having the same wasted and destroyed and the officers of the Nation are authorized to put under oath and to exact information from any persons in searching for ardent spirits, and to procure search warrants to search any house in which there is good reason to believe liquors are concealed. The Sheriff may summon a guard to assist in wasting liquors should resistance be offered. Persons introducing or trading in spirits shall be fined $10 to $50 (one-fourth to the Sheriff and one-fourth to the Solicitor of the district). Failure in duty on the part of the Sheriff or Solicitor shall be fined $25 (Laws Cherokee Nation, 1839-67, p. 28 [passed 1841].) Any citizen is authorized to arrest any person guilty of introducing spirituous liquors, and who may be found conveying the same to any point thereof, and to waste them. And the members of any assembly or congregation for religious worship are authorized to take temporary measures for peace and harmony, by the suppression of the sale and indulgence in spirits in their vicinity, as may seem to them most proper and best. (Id., p. 29 [passed 1860].) The first of these acts was codified, with the penalty increased to $50 to $100, in Compiled Laws, Cherokee Nation, 1881, p. 161.

Chickasaw Nation.—All persons are prohibited from introducing spirituous liquors into this Nation under penalty of $10, and for all succeeding offenses $40. Any person giving away or selling such liquor shall be fined $25, and for succeeding offenses $50 (half to the informer in both cases). In case the offender refuse to pay the fine the liquor shall be confiscated and sold. The Sheriff or Constable shall destroy any whiskey or spirituous liquor in the Nation, and citizens called on are bound to assist, and those resisting such destruction may in self-defense be killed by the officers or citizens. (Laws Chickasaw Nation, 1860, p. 25 [passed 1856]; re enacted and approved, Id., p. 105 [1858].)

Choctaw Nation.—It is not lawful for any person to introduce for their own use or sell or give away any vinous, spirituous or intoxicating liquors, except wines for sacramental purposes by a member of the church, on penalty of $10 to $100, or on default of payment, imprisonment one to three months. Any person found with such liquors is deemed guilty. The Circuit Judges shall give this act in charge to the Grand Jury, who shall diligently inquire into violations of the same. In every conviction under the act the District Attorney shall be entitled to $5. The Sheriff, Light-horsemen and Constables are authorized, upon suspicion without warrant, to forcibly enter all places, search for and seize, break and destroy all bottles, barrels, jugs or any vessel containing liquor and arrest the persons in charge, and such officers shall receive $2 upon conviction of the offender. If any person sell or give away liquors, and any person be thereby maimed or injured, such seller shall be fined $5 to $100 for the person injured. (Laws Choctaw Nation, 1869, p. 163 [passed 1857].)

Iowa.

Earliest Provisions.—By the Revenue act of the first Legislature, groceries retailing liquors were taxed $100 in incorporated towns and $50 elsewhere. (Laws, 1838, p. 401.) By the Laws of 1839, c. 22, County Commissioners were to grant such licenses for $25 to $100, the applicant to give bond in $100 to keep an orderly house, and to be fined $10 to $50 for offenses against the law. And selling without license was fined $50 to $100. Selling on Sunday, except for medicine, was fined $5. (Laws, 1843, c. 43.)

The law was extended to all cities, and the penalty for selling without license was reduced to $30 to $50 by Laws of 1845, c. 28. The question of license or no-license was submitted to the voters of each county to determine. (Laws, 1846, c. 49.)

The second Legislature of the State enacted a license law, placing the fee at $50 to $125, with bond of $150 to keep an orderly house, and fining sales without license $50 to $150. (Laws, 1848, c. 67.)

Partial Prohibition (1855-84).—A Prohibitory liquor or Maine law was submitted to vote of the people on the first Monday of April, 1855. (Laws, c. 45.) In the case of State v. Santo (2 Ia., 165) the submission clauses were declared unconstitutional, but the rest of the law was upheld. This law excepted sales of five gallons or more of domestic wines and of cider by the maker when sold to be taken away at one time; appointed County Agents to sell liquor for medicinal, mechanical and sacramental purposes, and punished manufacturing by a fine of $100 for first offense, $200 for second, and $200 and imprisonment 90 days for third; the penalty for selling was $20, $50 and $100, and three to six months' imprisonment, for first, second and third offenses respectively. It declared the building or ground of unlawful sale, manufacture, or keeping a nuisance, and authorized search, seizure and forfeiture of liquors. By the act of 1857 (Laws, c. 157), any citizen except hotel-keepers, keepers of saloons, eating-houses, grocery-keepers and confectioners, was permitted to buy and sell liquors for mechanical, medicinal, culinary and sacramental purposes only, on procuring the certificate of 12 citizens of the town to his moral character, and giving bond in $1,000. He was to keep an accurate account of his purchases and sales. Purchasers buying of him were fined $10 for the first offense of making a false statement of the use for which liquor was required, and $20 and 10 to 50 days in prison for the second offense.

A license law, allowing County Judges to grant licenses upon petition of 12 freeholders of the township, with civil damage provisions, was enacted to be adopted by any county upon vote, after petition by 100 citizens of such county. (Laws, 1856, c. 221.) This act was declared unconstitutional in whole because of its submission clauses, and because it would not have a uniform operation. (Geebrick v. State, 5 Ia., 491.)

Wilfully selling adulterated or drugged liquors, was punished by fine not exceeding $500, or imprisonment for not over two years. (Laws, 1858, c. 140.) And by the Laws of 1858, c. 143, the manufacture and sale of beer, cider from apples or wine from grapes, currants or other fruits grown in this State, were excepted from the prohibitions of the law.

Persons selling liquor were charged with the expense of the care of the intoxicated person, and were made liable in civil damages for the injury caused by intoxication to any one's person, property or means of support. (Laws, 1862, c. 47.)

The privileges of buying and selling conferred by act of 1857, c. 157, were cut off by c. 94, Laws of 1862, and permits for the sale of liquor for such excepted purposes were required to specify the house of sale and the term of its continuance, with the same system of accounts for every purchase and sale elaborated. Such agent's permit was forfeited for unlawful selling. And search warrants were allowed to be issued upon information by one credible person of the county, instead of three. Sales of liquor at fairs were prohibited by Laws of 1864, c. 109. The Laws of 1868, c. 128, amended the granting of permits under the above laws, and made a hearing upon notice necessary to the granting of such permits, and directed the County Judge to consider the wants of the locality and the number of permits issued therefor in granting the same.

Incorporated cities and towns were given power to regulate or prohibit the sale of liquor for purposes not prohibited by the State law, *i.e.*, beer, wine and cider. (Laws, 1868, c. 154.) In 1870 the sale of beer, wine and cider was prohibited, but the Board of Supervisors of each county might determine whether a vote should be taken upon the question, and not till such a vote was in favor of Prohibition should such Prohibition be in force. (Laws, 1870, c. 82.) By Laws of 1872, c. 24, permits to sell for the excepted purposes were allowed, only upon petition of a majority of the legal voters of the township or ward. The bond of the holder of a permit was increased to $3,000, his profits were limited to 33⅓ per cent., and monthly returns of his sales to the Auditor were required. Penalties were $100. Druggists were not to sell liquor or its compounds as a beverage. (Laws, 1880, c. 75, § 9.) Selling on election day was prohibited by Laws of 1880, c. 82.

The Constitutional Amendment.—A Prohibitory Amendment to the Constitution was proposed to be submitted. (Laws, 1880, c. 215; Laws, 1882, p. 178.) This Amendment was invalidated, after adoption, on account of an informality in its passage, as indicated in the journals of the Legislature. (Koehler v. Hill, 60 Ia., 543.)

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—In 1884, 1886 and 1888 were passed the laws, more and more stringent and elaborate, which make up most of the present sections of the Revised Code of 1888 upon the subject. Citations that follow are to McClain's Code of 1888. The corresponding matter is found in Miller's Revised Code, at § 1523 and following.

No person shall manufacture or sell, directly or indirectly, any intoxicating liquors except as hereinafter provided. Keeping liquor with intent to sell the same unlawfully is prohibited; and the liquor and vessels containing it are declared nuisances. (Code, 1888, § 2359.)

Persons holding permits may sell intoxicating liquors for pharmaceutical and medicinal purposes, alcohol for specified chemical purposes, and wine for sacramental purposes. Permits must be procured of the District Court, and continue one year, with renewal annually upon showing to the Court that the law has been complied with the preceding year, and giving a new bond; but parties may resist renewals the same as applications for permits. (Id., § 2360.) Notice of application for permit must be published three weeks in a newspaper of the city, town or county. And in one of the official papers of the county. It shall state the name of the applicant, the purpose of the application, the particular location of the place where liquor is proposed to be sold, and that the petition will be on file 10 days before the first day of the term when the application will be made, and a copy thereof shall be served on the County Attorney. (Id., § 2362.) Application for permits shall be by petition, stating the applicant's name, place of residence, present business and business for two years previously, a particular description of the place of sales, that he is a citizen of the State, a registered pharmacist and proposes to sell liquor as the proprietor of such pharmacy, that he has not been convicted of unlawful liquor-selling for two years, does not keep a hotel, eating-house, saloon, restaurant or place of public amusement, that he is not addicted to the use of liquor as a beverage, and has not been engaged in unlawful liquor traffic for two years. (Id., § 2364.) The permit shall issue, or be renewed, only upon a bond by the applicant in $1,000, conditioned to observe the law relating to the sale of liquor, and to pay all fines, penalties, damages and costs against him. Such bond shall be for the benefit of any person damaged by reason of violation of the permit. (Id., § 2364.)

The applicant shall file, 10 days before the term, in support of the application, a petition signed by one-third of the freehold voters of the township, town, city or ward in which the permit is to be used. Each person shall state that he has read the petition and is personally acquainted with the applicant, that he is a resident of the county, over 21 years of age, of good character, reputed to be law-abiding, has not been found guilty of violating the liquor laws for two years, is not in the habit of using liquor as a beverage, that the permit is necessary for the convenience and accommodation of the people of the locality, and that he believes the applicant is worthy of confidence and will observe the law. At or before 9 A. M. of the first day of the term, a remonstrance against the granting of the permit may be filed by any person. (Id., § 2365.) On the first day of the term, having ascertained that the application is properly presented, the Court shall hear it unless objection is made, and if objection is made it shall be set down for hearing during the term. The County Attorney or any citizen, or his attorney, may resist the application, and in any case the Court shall not grant the permit until it appears by evidence that the applicant is worthy of confidence and that the application and petition are altogether true. If more than one permit for the same locality is asked for at the same time, the various applications shall be heard together, and any or all shall be refused or granted, as will best subserve the public interest. (Id., § 2367.) Permits shall not issue until the applicant makes oath, to be endorsed upon the bond, that he will not sell unlawfully and will make required returns of sales. (Id., § 2367.)

Permits shall be deemed trusts reposed in the recipients, not as a matter of right, and may be revoked by order of the Court upon sufficient showing. Complaint, sworn to by three citizens, may at any time be presented to the District Court; and, with five days' notice to the accused to appear, the Court may hear and determine the controversy and the permit may be suspended during its pendency. After revocation of a permit for violation of law, such adjudication may, in the discretion of the Commissioners of Pharmacy, work a forfeiture of the certificate of registration as a pharmacist, and upon receipt of a record showing a second such violation of law, such Commissioners shall cancel such registration. The Clerk must forward such records to them. (Id., § 2368.) If no registered pharmacist shall obtain a permit not in any township, some person not a registered pharmacist may under like conditions obtain a permit. (Id., § 2369.)

All papers relating to the granting or revocation of permits shall be filed as part of the records of the Clerks' offices. The applicant for permit shall pay all the costs incurred in any case, except the costs of any malicious resistance. (Id., § 2370.)

When any person holding a permit desires to purchase liquor for use thereunder, he shall apply to the County Auditor for a certificate authorizing such purchase, which must be attached to the way-bill accompanying the shipment as authority to the common carrier. After use such certificate shall be returned to the Auditor, who shall cancel, file and preserve the same. (Id., § 2371.) Requests for liquor shall be dated and shall state the age and exact residence of the signer and person for whose use the liquor is required, the amount and kind required, its purpose, that neither the applicant nor the person who is to use the liquor uses liquor as a beverage, and be signed by the applicant and attested by the permit-holder, but must not be granted by the permit-holder unless he personally knows the applicant and that he is not a minor or person addicted to drunkenness, and is of good character, and believes the application is true. If he does not know the applicant, one whom he does know must in writing vouch for such applicant in the same way. The requests shall be upon blanks numbered consecutively, furnished by the County Auditor, in books of 100 to holders of permits, who shall, after filling, return to the Auditor, who will file and preserve the same. All unused or mutilated blanks shall be returned or accounted for before other blanks shall be issued to the permit-holder. (Id., § 2372.)

On or before the 10th day of each month, each permit-holder shall make returns, under oath, to the Auditor, of all requests filled by him. Every permit-holder shall keep strict account of all liquors purchased by him, and the amounts sold and used, and the amount on hand, each month. Such accounts shall be open for inspection by officers, and shall be evidence. Monthly statements thereof shall be made to the Auditor with the return of the above requests. (Id., § 2373.) On trial for illegal sales under permits, the requests for liquors and returns made to the Auditor, the general repute of the accused, and his manner of conducting his business, and the character of applicants for liquor, shall be competent evidence. (Id., § 2374.)

Registered pharmacists, not permit-holders, are authorized to obtain liquors (not including malt) of permit-holders, for compounding medicines, tinctures and extracts that cannot be used as beverages, at not over 10 per cent. net profit on such liquors, such purchasers to keep and return monthly to the Auditor a record of such purchases and the uses made thereof. The Commissioners of Pharmacy are directed to make rules to govern this subject and revoke registrations of pharmacists abusing the trust. (Id., § 2375.) A permit-holder may employ not more than two registered pharmacists as clerks, for whose acts he is personally responsible. (Id., § 2376.) The Commissioners of Pharmacy are to have as a fund for further prosecutions 50 per cent. of all fines collected in prosecutions instituted by them. (Id., § 2378.)

Any person making a false signature or representation upon papers required by this act shall be fined $20 to $100, or imprisoned 10 to 30 days. Permit-holders or clerks making false oaths shall be punished for perjury. Permit-holders violating the law are guilty of misdemeanors. (Id., § 2379.)

Selling or giving to minors, except upon written order of parent or guardian or physician, or to any intoxicated person or habitual drunkard, is fined $100 (half to the informer). (Id., § 2389.)

Selling without a permit, by any device, is fined $50 to $100 for first offense, and $300 to $500, with imprisonment not exceeding six months, for subsequent offenses. (Id., § 2381.) Persons keeping liquor for illegal sale shall be punished as last stated above, except that such imprisonment is alternative. (Id., § 2383.)

In cases of unlawful manufacture, sale or keeping, the building or ground upon which it happens is a nuisance and the user is fined not over $1,000. Any citizen of the county may maintain an action to abate and perpetually enjoin the same, and any person violating any such injunction shall be fined $500 to $1,000, or imprisoned not more than six months, or both. (Id., § 2384.) It is the duty of the County Attorney to institute actions to enjoin such nuisances. (Id., § 2385.)

In any such action the Judge may grant a temporary injunction, if the nuisance is being maintained, as of course. (Id., § 2386.) A Judge may summarily try and punish parties violating such injunction, by the penalty of § 2384, which (if imprisonment alone) must be three to six months. (Id., § 2387.) If the existence of such a nuisance has been established by action, it shall be abated by order of Court, by seizing and destroying liquor therein, removing all fixtures of the business in the building, and closing the same against occupation for saloon purposes, for one year. (Id., § 2389.) If an owner appear and pay costs, and file a bond in the full value of the property, conditioned that he will immediately so abate such nuisance, the action shall be abated. (Id., § 2391.)

Finding liquors in the possession of any one not authorized to sell the same, except in a private dwelling which is not used as a tavern, eating-house, or place of public resort, is presumptive evidence of illegal keeping. (Id., § 2392.)

After a conviction of keeping a nuisance, if any person engages in such unlawful business he shall be imprisoned three months to one year. But no equitable order or judgment shall be deemed such conviction. (Id., § 2393.) In no action to abate a nuisance shall fees be demanded in advance, and costs shall be paid as in other criminal cases. But the costs may be taxed to the prosecutor if he act maliciously and without probable cause. (Id., § 2396.) Any person enjoined in such action who again engages in the sale anywhere within the jurisdiction of the Court, shall be guilty of contempt. (Id., § 2398.)

Keeping a United States revenue "license" posted in any place of business is evidence that the person owning it is engaged in unlawful selling, and *prima facie* evidence that liquors found in possession of such person are kept unlawfully, if such person is not authorized by law. (Id., § 2400.)

Search-warrant is provided for upon complaint of any credible resident of any county upon oath that he believes particular liquor in a particular place is owned by the person named or described and is kept by him for unlawful sale. If the place named is a dwelling, it must be stated that liquor has been sold there within one month. (Id., § 2401.) The information and search warrant shall describe the place and liquor with reasonable particularity, but their insufficiency only entitles the owner to be heard upon the merits of the case. (Id., § 2402.) Upon seizure of liquor under search-warrant, the Justice issuing the warrant shall cause notice to be left at the place of such seizure and at the last known place of residence of the owner, summoning such person, from within five to 15 days, to appear and show cause why said liquor and the vessels containing it should not be forfeited. The proceedings shall be the same as in cases of misdemeanor. (Id., § 2404.) Whenever decided that such liquor is forfeited, warrant shall issue to an officer to destroy it; in the other case to return it. (Id., § 2405.)

If any person is found intoxicated, he may be taken by any peace officer without warrant, and may be fined $10 or imprisoned 30 days. But this may be remitted upon the prisoner's giving information when, where and of whom he purchased the liquor, provided he give bail to appear as a witness against the party who sold the liquor. (Id., § 2405.) In any information or indictment, it is not necessary to set out exactly the kind and quantity of liquor, nor the exact time of offense; and proof of any violation of liquor law, substantially as set forth and within the time mentioned, is sufficient. It is only necessary to allege second or subsequent offenses, without setting forth the record of the same. And the purchaser of liquor is a competent witness. (Id., § 2406.)

All debts for liquor unlawfully sold, and all contracts and securities based in whole or in part on such unlawful sale, shall be void, and no action for liquor sold in another State in violation of the law of this State shall be maintained.[1] (Id., § 2407.) All peace officers shall see that the provisions of this chapter are executed and shall prosecute violations, under penalty of $10 to $50 and forfeiture of their offices. (Id., § 2408.)

---

[1] The United States Supreme Court has decided that any State may not only lawfully suppress the manufacture of liquor intended for consumption within the State, but also the manufacture of liquor intended for transportation to or sale in another State. (Kidd v. Pearson, 128 U. S., 1.)

If any express or railway company, or common carrier. shall transport liquor from place to place in this State, without certificate of the Auditor as above mentioned, its agent so offending shall be fined $100. This offense is complete in any county of this State to or through which liquor is transported. or where unloaded. (Id., § 2410.) This section, in so far as it applied to liquors brought into the State from another State, was by the United States Supreme Court declared to be unconstitutional, as an attempt to regulate commerce between the States.[1] (Bowman v. Chicago & N. W. R R. Co., 125 U. S., 465.) Any person making a false statement to procure transporation of liquor by a common carrier, or falsely making it therefor, shall be fined $100. (Code, 1888, § 2411.) Liquors shall not be conveyed from point to point in this State by common carriers without being marked as such, and all liquors so carried shall be subject to seizure. (Id., § 2412.)

Every person, by himself or by associating with others, keeping a club or place in which liquors are distributed or divided among members, shall be fined $100 to $500, or imprisoned 30 days to six months. (Id., § 2413.)

Courts and juries shall construe the liquor laws to prevent evasion, and so as to cover giving as well as selling. (Id., § 2415.)

"Intoxicating liquors" include alcohol, ale, wine, beer, spirituous, vinous and malt and all intoxicating liquors whatever. (Id., § 2416.) Any person, by selling liquor unlawfully, who causes the intoxication of another, shall be liable for his keep and $1 a day additional. (Id., § 2417.) Every wife, child, parent, guardian, employer or other person, injured in person, property or means of support, in consequence of the intoxication of any person, has right to action for actual and exemplary damages against the person or persons selling liquors and causing such intoxication. (Id., § 2418.)

For all fines, costs and judgments under the liquor law, the real property of the defendant and of the owner knowingly permitting the business on his property, are liable. And any bond given by defendant may be sued therefor. (Id., § 2419.)

Persons making false statements to procure liquor of those authorized to sell, shall be fined $10; for the second offense, $20 and imprisonment 10 to 30 days. (Id., § 2420.)

There is a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. (Code, 1888, § 2384; passed in 1886, c. 1.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by a majority of all the members of the two Houses, and if concurred in by similar majorities in the next Legislature may be submitted to the people for ratification or rejection —a majority vote of the people being necessary.

Kansas.

Earliest Provisions.—The Laws of 1859, c. 91, required the petition of a majority of the householders of the township or ward for a license, and $50 to $500 license fee. Selling without license was fined not to exceed $100. Selling on Sunday, election day or 4th of July was fined $25 to $100, with imprisonment 10 to 30 days and forfeiture of license. Persons licensed had to give bond in $2,000. They were not to sell to intoxicated persons or to married men against the known wishes of their wives. Full civil damage provisions were included. This act did not apply to corporate cities of over 1,000 inhabitants, which had full power to regulate licenses themselves.

Complete Prohibition was enacted for the unorganized counties of the State in 1867. (Laws, c. 81.)

The Constitutional Amendment.—In 1879, by Laws, c. 165, the Amendment, "The manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors shall be forever prohibited in this State, except for medical, scientific and mechanical purposes," was proposed, and it was adopted in 1880, becoming § 10 of Art. 15 of the Constitution. In 1881 was passed a complete Prohibitory law, which, as amended in 1885 and 1887 is summarized below.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—Any person or persons who shall manufacture, sell or barter any spirituous, malt, vinous, fermented, or other intoxicating liquors, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, provided that such liquors may be sold for medical, scientific and mechanical purposes, as provided by law. (C. L., 1885, § 2287.) It shall be unlawful to sell liquor for the above excepted purposes without procuring a druggist's permit therefor from the Probate Judge, who has discretion to grant the same for one year to any person of good character who is a registered pharmacist, engaged in the business of a druggist, who can be intrusted with the responsibility of so selling; and such Judge may at any time revoke such permit. To obtain such permit the applicant shall file, 30 days before hearing thereon, a petition, signed by the applicant and 25 reputable freeholders who are electors, and 25 reputable women over 21 years, residing in the township, city of the third class or ward, setting forth the place where such business is located, that the applicant is of good character, etc., and does not use liquor as a beverage, and that said applicant has a stock of drugs if in a city of at least $1,000 value, or elsewhere $500 value. The applicant shall publish a notice of his application, and shall be required to prove the truth of every statement in the petition; and the County Attorney shall, and any other citizen may, appear and oppose. The permit, if granted, shall be recorded upon the journal of the Probate Court, and a certified copy thereof posted in a conspicuous place in the store where the business is carried on. The druggist shall file bond in $1,000 not to violate the law. Any applicant or citizen may appeal from the Probate Judge's decision to the District Court, but not therefrom. Upon a petition, on oath, by 25 reputable men and 25 reputable women of the township, city or ward aforesaid, requesting the revocation of the permit, the Judge shall cite such druggist to appear; and if it appear that he is not in good faith carrying out the law, his permit may be cancelled. On appeal as above, the permit shall be inoperative until the appeal is decided. But the Probate Judge may cancel any permit at any time of his own motion. Such Judge issuing a permit to one not legally qualified shall be fined $500 to $1,000, and any person signing a petition for any applicant known to him to be in the habit of becoming intoxicated or not in good faith a druggist, shall be fined $50 to $100. (Laws, 1887, c. 165, § 1.)

---

[1] The Supreme Court has decided that so long as Congress does not specially authorize States to prohibit the inter-State traffic in liquors, such imported liquors may not only be lawfully imported into one State from another State, but may also be sold in the original packages at the point of their destination, despite State prohibitions to the contrary. (Leisy v. Hardin [1890], 135 U. S., 100.) But by an act passed in 1890, Congress concedes to each State the right to deal with imported liquors the same as with liquors manufactured within its own borders.

Any regular physician in case of actual need may give prescription for liquor or administer it himself. But if he does so to evade the law he shall be fined $100 to $500, or be imprisoned 10 to 90 days. (C. L., 1885, § 2289.) Any druggist having a permit may sell for medical purposes only on affidavit of the person for whom the liquor is required, setting forth the purpose, kind and quantity, that it is actually needed by the named patient, and stating that it is not intended as a beverage and that the applicant is over 21 years of age Such druggists may sell for mechanical and scientific purposes only upon a similar affidavit. There shall be but one delivery on one affidavit, and no druggist shall permit drinking on his premises. Any such druggist may sell in quantities not less than a gallon to another druggist having a permit. The affidavits above required shall be provided by the County Clerks in printed book forms of 100 each, consecutively numbered. The books must be indorsed with the date of delivery and the name of the person to whom delivered, and be signed and sealed with the official seal. The Clerk must keep two exact copies (except as to the numbers of the blanks), a record of the series, and the numbers thereof delivered to each druggist. These copies of the books must be filed one by the Clerk and one in the office of the Probate Judge as well as the Clerk's records of deliveries of books. Such affidavits filed by the druggists, while they remain in book form, must with an affidavit be returned monthly to the Probate Judge. The druggist must also file at the same time an affidavit of the amounts of liquor purchased by him and the amounts remaining on hand. The Probate Judge shall receive no fees under this act, but receives $15 per annum for each 1,000 inhabitants of his county, not to exceed $1,000.

Persons making false affidavits for liquors shall be guilty of perjury and imprisoned six months to two years. A person subscribing any other name than his own to such shall be guilty of forgery in the fourth degree. Persons selling to others liquor so obtained, upon affidavit, as a beverage, shall be fined $100 to $500 and imprisoned 30 to 90 days. Each druggist shall keep a daily record, in a book open for inspection, of all liquors sold by him or his employees. (Laws, 1887, c. 165, § 2.)

No person shall manufacture liquor except for the above-excepted purposes. To obtain a permit therefor one must apply by petition signed by 100 resident electors of the ward or by a majority of those of the township or city of the third class to the Probate Judge and file bond in $10,000. Such manufacturer shall sell only in original packages for such purposes, and for medical purposes only, to druggists duly authorized to sell, and shall not sell in less quantities than five gallons. (Laws, 1887, c. 165, § 6.)

Persons selling directly or indirectly without a permit shall be fined $100 to $500 and imprisoned 30 to 90 days. (Id., § 2293.) Persons manufacturing without permit shall be so punished; but making wine or cider from grapes or apples grown by the maker for his own use, or the sale of wine for communion purposes, is excepted from the prohibition. (Id., § 2294.)

A druggist not keeping the required record, or refusing permission to examine it, or failing to sign or make returns of affidavits, or selling as a beverage or when liquor is not a remedy for the ailment described, or selling to any minor or intoxicated person or habitual drunkard, or allowing liquor to be drunk on the premises, shall be fined $100 to $500 and imprisoned 30 to 90 days, forfeit his permit and be disqualified to obtain another for five years. (Laws, 1887, c. 165, § 3.)

All liquors mentioned in § 2287, C. L., and all other liquors or mixtures thereof, by whatever name called, that will produce intoxication, will be held intoxicating liquors. (C. L., 1885, § 2296.)

A permit to sell shall continue one year and a permit to manufacture five years unless sooner forfeited; but the Probate Judge may require the renewal of a manufacturer's bond at the end of any year on 30 days' notice, upon pain of forfeiture. (Id., § 2297.)

It is the duty of all Sheriffs, Constables, Marshals, Police Judges and police officers having knowledge of violations of this law to notify the County Attorney and furnish him the names of witnesses. If any such officer fail to do so, he shall be fined $100 to $500 and forfeit his office, and such officer may be removed therefor by civil action. (Id., § 2298; amended, 1887, c. 165, § 9.)

Places where liquors are manufactured or sold unlawfully, or where persons are permitted to resort for drinking liquor as a beverage, are declared nuisances; and upon judgment thereof the Sheriff, or any Constable or Marshal, shall be directed to abate such places by taking possession and publicly destroying liquors found and all property used in keeping such nuisance, and the keeper thereof shall be fined $100 to $500 and imprisoned 30 to 90 days. The County Attorney or any citizen may maintain action for such abatement. The injunction shall be granted at the commencement of the action without bond. Persons violating the injunction shall be punished for contempt by $100 to $500 fine and imprisonment 30 days to six months. (Laws, 1887, c. 165, § 4.)

Every person causing the intoxication of another by sales to him of liquor shall be liable to any one for the charge of such intoxicated person and $6 per day besides. (C. L., 1885, § 2300.) Every wife, child, parent, guardian, employer or other person who may be injured in person, property or means of support by the intoxication of any person has right of action for actual as well as exemplary damages against the person or persons causing such intoxication. (Id., § 2301.)

Every person, by himself or by associating with others, keeping a club-room or place where liquor is received and kept for sale, distribution or division among the members, shall be punished by fine of $100 to $500 and imprisonment 30 days to six months. (Id., § 2302.) Giving away liquor, or any shifts or devices to evade the provisions of the law, shall be deemed unlawful selling. (Id., 2303.)

All fines and costs for any violation of this law shall be a lien upon the real estate of the defendant and upon the building or premises where unlawful sales are knowingly permitted by the owner. (Id., § 2304.)

Upon application to the Probate Judge to sell or manufacture, the Judge shall notify the County Attorney, who shall advise with him. No person who shall inform under this act shall be liable for costs unless the prosecution is malicious or without probable cause. (Id., § 2305.) In prosecutions under this law it is not necessary to state the kind of liquor sold or the place where sold, except in nuisance cases and those in which lien is sought against the premises; nor is it necessary to state the name of the person to whom sold, and it is not necessary to prove in the first instance that the defendant did not have a permit. The persons to whom liquor is sold are competent witnesses, and so are the members of a club. No person is excused from testifying on the ground that he will be incriminated, but his testimony shall not be used against him. (Id., § 2306.)

All Courts shall charge the Grand Juries especially with this law. (Id., § 2307.)

If the County Attorney is notified by any person or officer of any violation of this law, he is authorized to subpœna any person he believes to have knowledge thereof to appear before him to testify; and if such testimony disclose a violation the County Attorney shall file a complaint against the person and in the warrant direct the officer to seize liquors which are particularly in such person's possession, and such liquors shall be destroyed or returned to the person according to the result of the case. (Id., § 2310.) If any testimony before the County Attorney as above provided for discloses the sale of liquor by an unknown person, said Attorney upon complaint filed shall issue warrant to search the premises as particularly described and seize all liquors therein and arrest the keepers thereof, who if found guilty shall be fined $100 to $500 and be imprisoned 30 to 90 days, and the property shall be seized and destroyed. The County Attorney shall receive 20 per cent. of all sums so collected. (Id., § 2312.)

The County Attorney shall diligently prosecute violations of this law, and the bonds given thereunder, and if he fail to do so is guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be fined $100 to $500 and imprisoned 10 to 90 days and forfeit his office. Whenever the County Attorney is unable or neglects to so prosecute, the Attorney-General shall do so in his stead. (Laws, 1887, c. 165, § 5.)

Any person receiving an order for liquors from any person in this State, or contracting with any such person for the sale thereof, except such person is authorized to sell under this law, shall be punished for selling liquors. (C. L., 1885, § 2314.)

Whenever any relative of any person notifies any druggist that such person uses liquor as a beverage and shall forbid sales to him, druggists so selling to him shall be fined $100 to $500 and imprisoned 30 days to six months. (Id., § 2315.) Treating or giving liquor to any minor by any person but the parent or guardian or physician of such minor, shall be punished as last above. (Id., § 2316.)

Common carriers knowingly carrying or delivering liquor to or for any person, to be used unlawfully, shall be fined $100 to $500 and imprisoned 30 to 60 days.

Any citizen may employ an attorney to assist the County Attorney to perform his duties as associate-counsel. (Id., § 2318.)

County Clerks or Probate Judges neglecting or refusing to perform their duties under this law shall be fined $500 to $1,000 and forfeit their offices. (Laws, 1887, c. 165, § 7.)

Drunkenness in any public place, or in one's own house disturbing his family or others, is fined not over $25, or punished by imprisonment not exceeding 30 days, or both. (C. L., 1885, § 2223.)

In any election hereafter held in any city of the first, second or third class, for the election of city or school officers or for the purpose of authorizing the issuance of any bonds for school purposes, the right of any citizen to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex; and women may vote at such elections the same as men, under like restrictions and qualifications, and any woman possessing the qualifications of a voter under this act shall be eligible to any such city or school office. (G. S., 1889, § 1084; passed 1887, Laws, c. 230.)

The Governor shall by the advice and consent of the Senate appoint a Board of Police Commissoners of three members in any city of the first class, provided he may refrain from making such appointment if not necessary for the good government of the city, in each case. (G. S., 1889, § 733, § 1; passed 1887, c. 100, § 1.) These Commissioners shall appoint a Police Judge and a Marshal who shall be Chief of Police, and as many policemen as necessary (not exceeding one for every 1,500 inhabitants). They may appoint special policemen to serve at any designated time or place at the expense of the persons applying therefor. (Id., §§ 734-5.) Neither the Mayor nor Council shall have any government of such police force. (Id., § 739.) The Attorney-General of the State or the Assistant Attorney-General of each county may upon petition of 50 householders, or shall upon direction of the Executive Council, prosecute an action in *quo warranto* against the Mayor and Councilmen of any city of the second class which by means of license pretends to authorize, or by simulated fines or forfeiture attempts to foster and encourage the illegal manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, or shields offenders against the laws of the State relating thereto, or habitually neglects to require the police officers to perform their duties under such laws. (Id., § 743.)

In case of ouster of the Mayor in such suit, the Governor shall appoint Police Commissioners as in case of cities of the first class. (Id., § 745.)

There is a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. (G. S., 1889, § 5669; passed in 1885, c. 169.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by vote of two-thirds of each House, at one session; popular vote to be taken at the next general election of Representatives, three months' notice to be given. A majority carries it.

Kentucky.

Earliest Provisions.—In 1793 the existing Virginia acts were repealed. Licenses were to be given by the County Courts to persons not of bad character, upon their giving bond in £100 to provide tavern accommodations for travelers, not to suffer unlawful gaming, or suffer any person to tipple or drink more than necessary, or allow disorder. Selling without license was fined £3, and on second offense the liquor was confiscated besides. Producers of liquor might retail not less than a quart not to be drunk on the premises. (Littel's Stats, vol. 1, p 194.) In 1819 it was provided that County Courts were not to grant licenses unless a majority of the Justices of the Peace of the county were present and the applicants showed that they had tavern accommodations. Persons making tavern-keeping a mere pretense to sell liquor were liable to $200 fine (half to the informer). (Laws, 1819, c. 467.) In 1823 it was provided that cider and beer might be retailed without license. (Laws, 1823, c. 639.) A license tax of $10 was required in 1831. (Laws, c. 595.) By the Laws of 1833, c. 511, tavern-keepers had to take oath not to sell to slaves except by permission of their masters, and persons of color were not to be licensed. In 1845 (Laws, c. 417, §§ 1, 2, 3 and 4), it was made unlawful for any free negro or mulatto to manufacture or sell any spirituous liquors, upon penalty of $50 to $300 and committal until paid. In 1848 (Laws, c. 654), licenses to retail spirituous liquors were taxed $10 for the county, and persons licensed by any town or city were not to sell until such tax was paid. In 1849 selling or giving liquor to slaves was fined $50, with forfeiture of license, if any. (Laws, 1849, c. 444.)

Legislation Since 1850.—By the Revenue act of 1850 (Laws, c. 14), license to retail liquor was kept at $10 and a merchant's license to sell liquor at $5. And c. 490 of the same laws prohibited adulteration of liquor and provided for analysis of suspected liquors and fine of not more than $500 or less than 20 cents per gallon for knowingly buying or selling adulterated liquor, and Inspectors were to condemn the liquor. The privilege of selling spirituous liquor was declared not to be implied in any tavern, coffee-house or restaurant license, but to be taxed for the State extra at $10 to $25 in the discretion of the licensing authority. Merchants', druggists' and other licenses to sell not less than one quart were to be granted by County Courts at $5 to $15, but no druggist selling exclusively for medical purposes needed a license. (Laws, 1851, c. 116.) On p. 41 of the same sessions' laws, taverns were regulated as having liquor-selling rights, and their suppression for being disorderly and unlawfully selling liquor, as well as for not providing sufficient accommodations to travelers, was provided for. Distillers were allowed licenses as merchants. Keeping a tippling-house without license was fined $60; and retailing without license within a mile of a place of worship was fined $20.

Selling to a minor without consent of his parent was prohibited in 1859. (Laws, c. 1133.) This provision was amended in 1869 (Laws, c. 232) to include lager beer in Louisville.

By the Laws of 1865-6, c. 886, all licenses to sell liquor granted by special act were repealed, and at this session began the series of local acts prohibiting licensing, prohibiting selling and providing Local Option in special localities having schools and churches, and also granting Prohibition or Local Option in districts, towns and counties. These acts soon became very numerous each session, and culminated in a General Local Option law in 1874, though the number of special acts passed by the Legislature for localities did not decrease, and such special acts are still passed at each session.

There are no other features of the progress of legislation to justify tracing the sequence of enactments.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—Licenses to sell at retail spirituous, vinous or malt liquors shall be granted by the County Court; but no such license shall be granted until 10 days' notice has been had by posting in five places, or if a majority of the legal voters of the neighborhood protest against the same. The Court shall determine what is the neighborhood in each case. (G. S, 1887, p. 1047, § 1.)

The tax on licenses shall be to retail spirituous and vinous liquor alone, $100; malt liquor alone, $50; all three, $150. (Id., § 2.) Selling any liquors without a license is fined $20 to $100. (Laws, 1887-8, p. 70.) Persons selling in packages of less than five gallons shall be considered as retail dealers. (G. S., 1887, p. 1048, § 3.)

The license shall specify the place of business, and none but the person named can sell under the same, nor shall it be done at any other place. It is valid for one year only and is not assignable, nor shall the Clerk give copies or duplicates thereof. (Id., p. 1049, § 9.) A license granted by a city or town having authority shall be void unless the State license be obtained and the State tax paid. (Id., § 10.)

It shall be unlawful for any druggist in any place where the sale of spirituous, vinous or malt liquor is prohibited by law, to sell any such liquor or any nostrum containing alcohol which may be used as a beverage, unless he obtain a license to do business as a druggist in such place from the County Court. (G. S., 1887, p. 502, § 1.) Any person desirous of such a license shall give 10 days' notice of application therefor, to be posted and to be given the County Attorney. (Id., § 2.) The County Court may upon proof of the required notices and that the applicant is of good character and in good faith a dealer in drugs and medicines, grant a license to sell liquors under this act, provided he give bond not to violate the liquor laws. (Id., § 3.) Any druggist selling any liquor in any place where retailing is prohibited without obtaining this license, or while his license is suspended, is fined $50 to $100 or imprisoned 10 to 30 days, or both. (Id., § 4.) No person so licensed under this act shall sell any liquor except upon the regular prescription of a regular practicing physician, which prescription shall be pasted in a book and preserved by the druggist, and such prescription shall authorize but one sale and no more than a quart. (Id., § 5.) Those violating the last section are liable to fine of $50 to $100. (Id., § 6.) And upon such judgment the license shall be forfeited. And any surety on the bond of a licensee may be released upon application, and the license be suspended until a new bond is given. (Id., § 7.) Any physician giving such a prescription not in good faith, upon a proper examination, and believing the person to be sick and in need of such liquor as a medicine. shall be fined $50 to $200. (Id., § 8.)

Any person charged on affidavit with a violation, upon examination by a magistrate, shall be held to bail or committed to answer. (Id., § 9.) It is the duty of the County Attorney to resist the improper granting of licenses under this act. (Id., § 10.) A rejected applicant for such a license has an appeal to the Circuit Court, where the application shall be heard *de novo*. (G. S., 1887. pp. 504-5.)

Tavern licensees must give bonds not to suffer any person to tipple or drink more than is necessary in their houses. (G. S., 1887, p. 1231, § 4.)

The County Court may suppress tavern licenses for violations of the bond until the next County Court session, when if the tavern-keeper is guilty he will be disqualified to keep a tavern thereafter; if not, he will be restored to his right. (Id., § 5.) Any tavern-keeper who sells liquor while his license is so suppressed or suspended, or until the order for the same is reversed, is guilty of keeping a tippling-house. (G. S., 1887, p. 1232, § 9.)

The County Court shall every year fix the prices to be paid in taverns for wines, liquors, lodging, diet, etc.; penalty, $30 fine. (Id., § 11.) Every tavern-keeper must keep such scale of prices posted up in his public room under penalty of $75. (Id., § 12.)

The Clerk of the county shall make out a list of licensed taverns and vendors of spirituous liquors in his county and deliver it to the Circuit Court to be laid before the Grand Jury on the first day of every term, under penalty of $20. (Id., § 13.)

A merchant may sell at his storehouse, to be taken off and drunk elsewhere, any liquor not less than a quart, on obtaining of the County Court a license. (G. S., 1887, p. 1233, § 1.) License will be so granted upon satisfactory evidence that the applicant is in good faith a merchant and his business is that of retailing merchandise, and that he has not assumed it with the object of obtaining a license to sell liquors. (Id., § 2.) Distillers have the privilege of selling at their residences any spirits of their own manufacture, not less than a quart, not to be drunk on the premises. (G. S., 1887, p. 1234, § 3.)

The privilege to sell liquors shall not be implied in any license to keep a tavern or coffee-house, boarding-house, restaurant or other place of entertainment, unless the licensing authority deem it expedient and specify the privilege in such license. (Id., pp. 1234–5.) On trial for suffering a person to tipple or drink more than is necessary in a tavern or coffee-house, the intoxication of any habitue of such place shall be *prima facie* evidence. (Id., p. 1235, § 2.) It shall be deemed a breach of the bond of any licensed retailer if he sell or give liquor to an intoxicated person. (Id., § 3.) Any licensee shall be fined $25 for selling to any known inebriate. And any relative of the inebriate may recover a like amount for his own benefit if notice has by such relative been previously given forbidding such sales. (Id., p. 1235.)

Upon written petition of at least 20 legal voters in any civil district, town or city in his county, the County Judge shall make an order directing the Sheriff or other officer to open a poll in such place at the next regular State, town, city or county election held therein, to take the sense of the voters whether or not liquors shall be sold therein. (G. S., 1887, p. 470, § 1.) Such officer shall give notice of such election two weeks in a newspaper and by posting hand-bills 20 days before the election. (Id., § 3.) At the poll the question shall be propounded, "Are you in favor of the sale of spirituous, vinous or malt liquors in this district, town or city?" (Id., § 4.) If a majority is against selling, that fact shall be certified to the Clerk, who at the next term shall have the same spread upon the order-book. (Id., § 5.) After such entry any person selling liquor in that district shall be fined $25 to $100. (Id., § 6.) This act shall not apply to any manufacturer or wholesale dealer, or to druggists selling on physicians' prescriptions. But physicians must not give such prescriptions except for medicine for a person actually sick. (Id., § 7.) The County Judge shall not make an order for such an election until the signers of the petition have deposited with him sufficient money to pay advertising expenses and legal fees. (Id., § 8.) Such an election shall not be held oftener than once in two years. (Id., § 9.)

Persons knowingly selling or preparing for sale any wine or liquor containing any adulteration shall be fined not more than $500 for each offense or less than $20 for each gallon so adulterated. (G. S., 1887, p. 787, § 8.) When an Inspector suspects liquor to be adulterated he shall procure its analysis by a skilful chemist at the cost of the owner, and if it contains anything impure or other than the extract of grain or substance from which it ought to be made, he shall mark the cask "condemned for impurity." (G. S., 1887, p. 787, § 1.) In prosecutions against wholesale dealers under this section the fact of rectifying the liquor shall be *prima facie* evidence of any adulteration on the part of the dealer. (Id., p. 788, § 2.)

A tavern-keeper indicted for breach of his obligation, on conviction shall have judgment rendered against him, and such of his sureties as have notice, for $300. (G. S., 1887, p. 459, § 1.) Any tavern-keeper receiving a greater price than tavern rates fixed shall be fined $5. (Id., § 2.) Any person (unless licensed) selling liquor to be drunk on the premises, shall be guilty of keeping a tippling-house and fined $60. (Id., § 3.) For keeping a tippling house three months he shall be liable in $[illegible]00. (Id., p. 460, § 4.) Twice selling in the same house shall be evidence of keeping a tippling-house. (Id., § 5.) Any person retailing without authority shall be fined $20. (Id., § 6.) No person shall vend or buy liquor within a mile of any place of public worship during service, except in authorized houses, upon pain of $10 fine. (Id., § 7.) It is unlawful to sell within one mile of any lock or dam where the general Government is improving a stream, under penalty of $50 to $100. This does not apply to incorporated places or to Henry, Anderson and McLean Counties. (G. S., 1887, p. 461.)

Any person selling to an "infant" under 21 years of age, without special direction of the father or guardian, shall be fined $50, but if to a person over 18 years, the seller shall not be deemed guilty if he had reason to believe him 21. (Id., § 9.)

Selling on Sunday, or keeping a bar or store for the sale of liquor on Sunday, is unlawful and subject to a fine of $2 to $50, and the third offense forfeits license. (G. S., 1887, pp. 436–7.)

No liquors shall be sold in any room where a billiard, pigeon-hole or pool-table is kept, upon penalty of $60. (G. S., 1887, p. 1052, § 21.)

Distilled spirits are taxed as other property for State and county purposes. (G. S., 1887, pp. 1092–6.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be obtained only through the action of a Constitutional Convention, provision for calling such Convention to be made by vote of a majority of the two Houses during the first 20 days of any regular session, and to be concurred in by a majority vote of the electors at the next general election for Representatives.

Louisiana.

Early Provisions.—An undated law, at p. 41 of the Laws of Louisiana Territory (St. Louis, 1809), gave the Courts of Quarter Sessions the right to grant licenses; selling without license was fined $10 per day; $10 to $30 was charged for license, and sales by unlicensed persons were fined $5. But the act of 1805, at the second session of the Legislative Council of the Territory, gave the County Judge the licensing power. The licensee was to pay a tax of $30 and give a bond in $500 to obey the law. Selling without license was fined $49. The act did not apply to New Orleans. (2 Martin's Dig., p. 429.) An act of 1806 required the applicant for an inn-license to be recommended by two freeholders. No one was to sell or give liquor to a slave without consent of his master, or to any Indian under penalty of $20 and forfeiture of license. Merchants or shopkeepers might sell in quantities over two quarts. Selling to United States soldiers without permission of their commandant, and allowing gaming, were fined $20 (half to the informer). (Id., p. 430.)

The act of 1812 punished selling to Indians by fine of $200 (half to the informer), besides making the seller liable for any damages arising from the Indian's intoxication. (Id., p. 438.) Under the Black Code (passed in 1806), selling liquor to a slave without the master's written permission was fined $20 to $100 and rendered the seller liable to the master for any damages suffered. (1 Id., p. 622.)

The act of 1822 repealed the license tax, gave the police juries of parishes power to tax liquor-sellers as they thought proper and gave to the Mayor and Council of incorporated towns full power to regulate them, the tax to be levied not to exceed the State tax, except in New Orleans. (Dig. Laws, 1828, p. 566.)

By the Laws of 1848, No. 95, anyone selling or giving liquor to a slave forfeited his license, disqualified himself ever after to be licensed and was fined $200 to $400, and for the second offense $400 to $800. The owners or superintendents of slaves were excepted from this act.

Selling within two miles of Pleasant Hill Academy was prohibited by Laws of 1850, No. 286; but this did not apply to the regular dealers of the district.

Local Option Law of 1852.—By Laws of 1852, No. 105, the police juries of the parishes, the Selectmen of towns and Mayor and Aldermen of cities were given exclusive power to make such laws and regulations for the sale or prohibition of the sale of liquor as they should deem advisable, and to grant or withhold license for sale thereof as the majority of the voters of any ward, parish, town or city might determine by ballot. The State relinquished all right to grant such license, but held the right to collect the State tax from such licensed drinking-houses and shops. This was re-enacted with provision that the police juries and municipal authorities should adopt rules and regulations for the annual elections upon the subject, and that the act should be given in charge to the Grand Juries. (Laws, 1854, No. 221.)

Legislation of 1859–79.—Licensing of free negroes to keep coffee-houses, billiard-tables or retail stores where spirituous liquors were sold, was forbidden. (Laws, 1859, No. 16.)

By the Revenue act of 1869 (Laws, No. 114, § 3), every person selling wines or liquors by the drink was taxed $150, to go to the State. By the Election law of 1870 (c. 100, §§ 41–44), drinking-saloons within two miles of any polling-place were to be closed, and officers refusing to obey the election officers and close them were imprisoned three to six months and fined $100 to $500. Peace officers might issue warrant to any police officer or constable to close such places, and such functionary should seize the liquors, and the vessels, tents or booths containing them, and hold them until 24 hours after the election, releasing them on payment of $10.

In 1877 keepers of liquor places were prohibited selling liquor to a minor without an order signed by his father, mother or tutor. (Laws, 1877, c. 116.) Licenses to sell liquor to be drunk on the premises but not otherwise, were required to be obtained of the State Tax Collector. Then followed elaborate provisions for the use by each dealer of a barroom register or "Moffatt Register," to register every drink sold by turning a crank and striking a bell once for each five cents paid by the customer, a tax of one-fourth of one cent being levied on each five cents of receipts. Every violation of the act was fined not over $100 (one-third to the informer), with forfeiture of license and disqualification to hold one thereafter for one year. (Laws, 1878, No. 26.) This law was repealed by Laws of 1879, No. 27, which imposed an occupation tax of $85 on sellers by the drink and $15 on those selling less than a gallon but not less than a bottle, not to be drunk on the premises.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—The regulation of the sale of alcoholic or spirituous liquors is declared a police regulation, and the General Assembly may enact laws governing the sale and use. (Const., art. 170.) The General Assembly shall by law forbid the giving or selling of intoxicating drinks on the day of election within one mile of precincts at any election held within this State. (Const., art. 190.) The General Assembly may levy a license tax, and in such case shall graduate the amount of such tax to be collected from the persons pursuing the several trades, professions, vocations and callings. . . . No political corporation shall impose a greater tax than is imposed by the General Assembly for State purposes. (Const., art. 206.)

The police juries of the several parishes, and the municipal authorities of the towns and cities, shall have exclusive power to make such laws and regulations for the sale or prohibition of the sale of liquor as they may deem advisable, and to grant or withold licenses from drinking-houses and shops within the limits of any city ward of a parish or town, as the majority of the voters thereof may determine by ballot; and the said ballot shall be taken whenever deemed necessary by the above-named authorities, not oftener than once a year. (R. L., 1884, § 1211.) The State relinquishes all right to grant licenses in any town, city or parish in which it is not granted by the authorities. Whenever any licenses may be granted, the State shall have power to collect the tax coming to the State for such licensed drinking-houses or shops. (Id., § 1212.)

It shall be the duty of the Judges of the several District Courts of this State, and the Judge of the Criminal Court of the parish of Orleans, to call the attention of the Grand Jury to the laws regulating the sale of liquors, at each jury term. (Id., § 1213.) It shall be the duty of the police juries of the several parishes and the municipal authorities aforesaid, to adopt such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this act. (Id., § 1214.)

Keepers of any disorderly inn, tavern, alehouse, tippling-house, etc., shall be fined or imprisoned, or both, at the discretion of the Court, and forfeit their licenses. (Id., § 908.) Whoever shall keep a grog or tippling-shop, or retail liquors without license, shall be fined $100 to $500. (Id., § 910; amended by Laws of 1886, No. 83, by making defense of sale on prescription good only in case of good faith.)

Selling to minors is prohibited as in Laws of 1877, c. 116, cited above.

By the Revenue law of 1886 (Laws, No. 101, p. 181), licenses to retail liquor were placed at from $50 for those doing a business of less than $2,000 annually to $750 for those receiving over $50,000 annually, in nine classes. Distilling, rectifying and brewing are taxed from $15 to $3,500 in 20 classes according to annual receipts. (Id., p. 176.) The same act, from p. 184 on, provides ways of enforcing and collecting licenses which are purely revenue rules rather than liquor or restrictive regulations.

There is a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. (Laws, 1888, No. 40.)

Lotteries.—Louisiana at this time (1890) enjoys the distinction of being the only State that sanctions lotteries. The Constitution (art. 167) provides that the General Assembly has authority to grant lottery charters or privileges, for not less than $40,000, to be paid annually into the State Treasury. All such charters shall cease Jan. 1, 1895, from which time all lotteries are prohibited. The charter of the Louisiana State Lottery Company is recognized as a contract binding upon the State until that period, except its monopoly clause, which is abrogated.

At the legislative session of 1890, an act was passed submitting a proposed Constitutional Amendment for re-chartering the Lottery Company.

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by vote of two-thirds of all the members of the two Houses, at one session; popular vote to be taken at the next general election for Representatives, three months' notice to be given. A majority carries it.

Maine.

Early Provisions.—Chapter 133 of the Public Laws of 1821 was the first license act. It provided that no one should presume to be a common victualler, innholder, or seller of wine, beer, ale, cider, brandy, rum or any strong liquors by retail, or in a less quantity than 28 gallons delivered at one time, except he was duly licensed, on pain of forfeiting $50; and if any person sold spirituous liquors or mixed liquors any part of which was spirituous, without license, he should forfeit $10. (P. L., 1821, c. 133, § 1.) The Selectmen, Treasurer and Clerk of each town were to meet on the second Monday in September, after posting notice thereof seven days, to license any persons of sober life and conversation qualified for the employment. Each person so licensed was to pay, for the use of the town, $6, and 25 cents to the Clerk. And at any other time license might be granted on payment of $1, and 50 cents per month thereafter. (Id., § 2.) No such license was to allow billiards or gaming, on penalty of $10, the person playing forfeiting $5. (Id., § 4.) Nor was he to suffer revelling or disorderly conduct, on penalty of $5, the reveller to pay $2. And no retailer was allowed to suffer any one to drink to excess upon his premises, or suffer minors or servants to sit drinking there, without permission of parents, guardians or masters respectively, on penalty of $5. (Id., § 5.) The Selectmen were to post up, in all liquor-places, the names of all persons reputed to be common drunkards, tipplers or gamesters after which such persons could not be sold drink on penalty of $5. (Id., § 6.) Liquor-sellers were not to entertain any persons, lodgers excepted, drinking or spending their time Saturday or Sunday evenings, on penalty of $3.

(Id., c. 9, § 5.) The act of 1824, c. 278, forbade licensed persons to sell in more than one place; and if any licensed person violated the law his license could not be renewed for two years. The Laws of 1829, c. 423, prohibited sales to soldiers of the United States Army, without permission of the commandant, if such commanding officer posted in the office of the Town Clerk a list of those belonging to his corps.

Rudimentary Local Option (1829).--Chapter 436 of the same year separated licenses to victualers and innholders from those to retailers of liquors, prohibiting the former classes of licensees to sell liquors to be drunk on the premises. And licenses to retail liquor to be drunk on the premises were only allowed after a vote at annual town meeting in favor of granting such licenses. This act provided that the Licensing Board might revoke licenses for violations of the law.

Chapter 482 of the Laws of 1830 simply consolidated the former licensing sections and reduced the licenses of those not selling liquors to $3. It, however, added a penalty of $10 for selling to Indians, unless under direction of a physician. It was provided that those aggrieved by any refusal to grant license or by any revocation of license, might appeal to the County Commissioners, who might grant the person a license in case of the improper withholding or revoking of license. (Laws, 1833, c. 77.)

Annual License Fee, $1 (1834).—The act of 1834 (Laws, c. 141), repealed all former acts and provided that license should be granted for $1, but exacted a bond in $300, the penalty of which was forfeited for disobeying the law. The special prohibitions and penalties were the same as in the first act in 1821.

Chapter 84 of laws of 1844 gave the Selectmen of towns power to license inns and common victuallers, restricting and prohibiting them from selling wine or any strong liquors by retail or in less quantity than 28 gallons at a time.

The Prohibitory Law of 1846.—By c. 205, Laws of 1846 (Aug. 7, 1846), the Selectmen at an annual meeting (of which seven days' notice had been given) might license one person in every town of less than 1,000 inhabitants, two in any having over 1,000, and three to five in any having over 3,000, to be sellers of wines and strong liquors for medical and mechanical purposes only. All other selling was prohibited. The penalty for selling in violation of these provisions was $1 to $20. On conviction for a second offense the offender was fined $5 to $20 and was to give bond in $50 not to violate the act for six months. And on breach of such bond license was to be revoked. Provisions denying right of action on obligations to pay for liquor sold in violation of the law, and for recovering payments made for such liquor, were added.

In 1848, by Laws, c. 67, the above-mentioned law was amended by adding the word "intoxicating" so as to provide for the prohibition of wine or spirituous or intoxicating liquors.

Selling liquor within two miles of cattle-shows was prohibited to those not licensed by Laws of 1849, No. 147.

Being a common seller of liquor without license was punished by forfeiture of $20 to $300 or by imprisonment 30 days to six months. (Laws, 1850, c. 202.)

The Maine Law of 1851.—The Prohibitory law which was the type and example of such laws passed since and called "Maine laws" wherever adopted, was passed June 2, 1851, as c. 211 of the laws of that year. It prohibited any one to manufacture or sell any intoxicating liquors, except as thereinafter provided. It empowered towns and cities to appoint agents for the sale of liquor for medicinal and mechanical purposes only. It punished selling in violation of the act, for the first conviction $10, second $20, third $20, with imprisonment three to six months. Clerks and agents were made equally guilty with principals. If any one of the Selectmen or Mayor and Aldermen indorsed his approval of the writ, the defendant was to recover costs. It was made the duty of these officers to prosecute violations of the law on being informed of them.

If the defendant prosecuted an appeal he was to give bond not to violate any of the provisions of the act pending the appeal, and in the event of final conviction the defendant was to suffer double the punishment first awarded against him.

This last paragraph was declared unconstitutional for increasing the penalty on account of taking out an appeal (State v. Gurney, 37 Me., 156), and for requiring a bond before appeal was allowed. (Saev v. Wentworth, 37 Me., 165.)

The municipal authorities were to revoke the appointment of Agent upon complaint and hearing thereupon, and prosecute his bond. Manufacturing and being a common seller without such appointment were punished in $100 for the first conviction, $200 for the second, and $200 with four months' imprisonment for third. Persons engaged in the unlawful traffic in intoxicating liquors were declared incompetent to sit upon any jury in any case under the act.

Search warrants, seizure and destruction of liquor were authorized upon complaint of three inhabitants. And liquor was again made void consideration for any promise to pay or payment made.

Definition of the Term "Maine Law."—A "Maine Law," then, is one prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor except by specially appointed or permitted agents who may sell for excepted purposes only, with provision for search, seizure and forfeiture of liquors kept for illegal sale. Nuisance and civil damage clauses were seldom inserted in such laws until they ceased being called Maine laws and were simply called Prohibitory liquor laws. Both of such last-named provisions may be found in stringent license laws, as well as search and seizure clauses.

By c. 48, Laws of 1853, the search, seizure and forfeiture provisions of the law were greatly elaborated and provisions to meet cases of destroying liquors to prevent seizure were included. Liquors used by any chemist, artist or manufacturer in his trade and the manufacture of cider and the sale thereof by the manufacturer, were exempted from the provisions of the law.

Agents were prohibited selling to minors without order of parent, and to intemperate persons.

Adulteration was prohibited and becoming intoxicated was punished by 30 days' imprisonment, which might be remitted whenever the Judge was satisfied the objects of the law and the good of the public would be advanced thereby.

The penalties were made $20 for first conviction, $20 and 30 days' imprisonment for second, $20 and 60 days for third, and $20 and four months for fourth and subsequent ones.

The law was entirely re-enacted in a very elaborate shape in 1855 (Laws, c. 166). Everything was wrought out in detail, especially in the search, seizure and forfeiture clauses. Exceptions in irregular and additional cases that had arisen or might arise in practice were sought to be provided for within the very words of the law. Not all of this elaboration has been preserved, for the law has been re-enacted and revised since. In the same year (1855) penalties were again increased, selling unlawfully being punished by fine of $20 and imprisonment 30 days for the first conviction up to $200 and six months for fourth and subsequent convictions. The first offense of unlawfully manufacturing carried $200 fine with six months' imprisonment. Common carriers and druggists were closely regulated by this act.

The Repeal of 1856.—All this legislation was swept away by Laws of 1856, c. 255, which was a license law allowing innkeepers to sell as such to guests and lodgers provided no bar were maintained, authorizing one or two persons to be licensed in each town and for each 3.000 inhabitants, not to sell to be drunk on the premises, and prohibiting keeping drinking-houses or tippling shops. The penalties were not exceeding $20 for the first conviction of selling to not exceeding $100 for the third, with alternative imprisonment not exceeding six months.

In 1858 the question was submitted to the people whether they would have the "License law of 1856 or the Prohibition law of 1858." They voted for the Prohibition law. The submission was made by c. 50 of the Laws of 1858. The law chosen was c. 33, which was comparatively short and moderate. It carried a penalty of only $10 for the first conviction of unlawful selling, rising to $20 and imprisonment three months for the third. An act of the same year (c. 54) declared houses for the illegal sale of liquor common nuisances, punished the keeper by a fine of not over $1.000 or imprisonment not over one year, and made his lease void, if a tenant; and the owner was subjected to the above penalty if he knowingly permitted his tenant's nuisance.

A State Commissioner to furnish liquor to Town Agents who were prohibited buying elsewhere, was established by Laws of 1862, c. 130. By the Laws of 1867, c. 133, the question was submitted to the vote of the people whether chapter 131 of that year, making an addition to the penalty formerly provided of 30 days' imprisonment on the first conviction and 60 days on second, and imprisonment corresponding to every other penalty which was without them, should be permitted to stand.

Civil damages were awarded by Laws of 1872, c. 63. The Laws of 1873, c. 150, repealed that part of the Laws of 1872 (c. 63) which added wine and cider to the list of intoxicating liquors, and which prohibited selling cider and domestic wines by any but the manufacturer.

The Constitutional Amendment.—The resolves of 1883 (c. 93) submitted a Prohibitory Amendment which was adopted in 1884.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—The manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors not including cider, and the sale and keeping for sale of intoxicating liquors, are and shall be forever prohibited. Except, however, that the sale and keeping for sale of such liquors for medicinal and mechanical purposes and the arts, and the sale and keeping of cider, may be permitted under such rules as the Legislature may provide. (Const., in force Jan. 1, 1885.)

Innholders and victuallers (who are not allowed to sell liquors) give bond among other things not to violate the laws relating thereto. (R. S., 1883, c. 27, § 2.) They are also prohibited suffering any revelling or disorderly conduct in their houses or any drunkenness or excess therein. (Id., § 12.)

The Governor and Council shall appoint a Commissioner to furnish municipal officers in this State and duly authorized agents of other States, with pure intoxicating liquors to be kept and sold for medicinal, mechanical and manufacturing purposes. He shall so sell no liquors until tested by a competent assayer and found pure. He shall sell at not over 6 per cent. above cost. (Id., § 15; amended by Laws of 1887, c. 140, § 1.) Municipal officers shall buy liquors of such Commissioner or of other such officers who have bought of him only. (R. S., 1887, c. 27, § 16.) If such officers buy of any other persons, or offer for sale liquors that have been forfeited or adulterated, or sell adulterated liquor, they are fined $20 to $100. (Id., § 17.) Said Commissioner shall keep a record of the names of the towns to which liquors are sold and of the persons buying therefor, the kind, quantity and price of liquor, and make annual report to the Governor. And he shall mail such a statement quarterly to each town that purchases of him. (Id., § 18.) Each Town Agent is to keep a record in a book of the liquor purchased by him and of each sale made, which record shall be open for inspection on penalty of $10 to $20. Knowingly misrepresenting to such Agent the purpose for which liquor is wanted is fined $20. (Id., § 19.) The Selectmen of any town and the Mayor and Aldermen of cities may each year buy liquor and appoint an Agent to sell it for medicinal, mechanical and manufacturing purposes only. Such Agent shall have no interest in the sale of such liquors, and be paid as the board appointing him provides. (Id., § 21; amended by Laws of 1881, c. 140, § 11.) Such Agent shall receive a certificate of his appointment and give bond in $600 to sell for the excepted purposes only and in accordance with law. (R. S., 1883, c. 27, § 22.) He may not sell to minors without the written direction of parent, master or guardian, to any Indian, soldier, drunkard, intoxicated person, or to any person liable to guardianship knowingly, or to any intemperate person of whose habits he has been notified by relatives or by the Aldermen, Selectmen or Assessors of any municipality. (Id., c. 27, § 23.) Whenever such municipal officers are informed by the relatives of any person of his intemperate habits, they shall give notice thereof to all persons authorized to sell liquors in their towns and such adjoining places as they deem expedient. (Id., § 24.) Any such Agent selling unlawfully shall be fined $20, and his bond be sued and his authority revoked, and the municipal authorities shall revoke such authority when they are satisfied of a violation. (Id., § 25.)

All liquors owned by municipalities must be conspicuously marked with the name of the town or of the Agent, and if liquors so marked are not so owned, that is conclusive evidence of keeping for illegal sale. (Id., § 26.)

If an Agent is convicted of an illegal sale he is forever disqualified from holding such office. (Id., § 27.)

Whoever manufactures for sale any intoxicating liquor except cider, and whoever sells any such liquor so manufactured by him in this State, except cider, shall be imprisoned two months and fined $1,000. (Id., § 28.) This chapter does not apply to the sale of unadulterated cider unless the same is sold to be used as a beverage or for tippling purposes. (Id., § 29; amended by Laws of 1887, § 2.)

Peddlers carrying around or obtaining orders for liquor are fined $20 to $500 (half to the complainant), and in default of payment they shall be imprisoned two to six months. (R. S., 1883, c 27, § 30; amended by Laws of 1885, c. 366, § 1.)

Railway or express companies transporting liquor from place to place to sell unlawfully, or agents removing liquors from cars anywhere but at established stations, shall be fined $50. All liquors intended for unlawful sale may be seized while in transit. (R. S., 1883, c 27, § 31; amended by Laws of 1887, c. 140, § 3.)

Municipal and police Judges and trial Justices have concurrent jurisdiction with the Supreme Judicial Courts in offenses under this law. (R. S., 1883, c. 27, § 32.)

No person except as authorized shall sell any intoxicating liquor. Wine, ale, porter, strong beer, lager beer and all other malt liquors and cider, when kept or deposited with intent to sell the same for tippling purposes, or as beverages, as well as all distilled spirits, are declared intoxicating within the meaning of the chapter; but this enumeration shall not permit any other pure or mixed liquors from being considered intoxicating. (R. S., 1883, c 27, § 33; amended by Laws of 1887, c. 140, § 4.)

Whoever sells intoxicating liquor in violation of law shall pay a fine of $50 and be imprisoned 30 days; on subsequent convictions he shall be fined $200 and imprisoned six months. Any clerk, servant or agent assisting in violation of law is equally guilty and shall suffer like penalties. (R. S., 1883, c. 27, § 34; amended by Laws of 1887, c. 140, § 5.) Whoever is a common seller of liquor shall be fined $100 and imprisoned 30 days, and on every subsequent conviction $200 and four months. (R. S, 1883, c. 27, § 35; amended by Laws of 1887, c. 140, § 6.) But persons selling as Town Agents are not common sellers. (R. S., 1883, c. 27, § 35.) No person shall keep a drinking-house or tippling-shop. Whoever sells liquor in any building or boat contrary to law, and if the same is there drank, is guilty of keeping a drinking-house or tippling-shop and shall be fined $100 and imprisoned 60 days, and on subsequent convictions $200 and six months. (R. S., 1883, c. 27, § 37; amended by Laws of 1887, c. 140, § 7.)

No person shall deposit or have in his possession liquors with intent to unlawfully sell the same. (R. S., 1883, c. 27, § 38.) Liquors so kept or deposited, intended for unlawful sale in the State, are contraband and forfeited to the municipalities where they are when seized. Any officer may seize liquor without a warrant and keep the same safely until he can procure one. (Id., § 39.)

If any person competent to be a witness in civil suits makes sworn complaint before a police or municipal Judge or trial Justice that he believes liquor is kept in any place for illegal sale, such magistrate shall issue his warrant to seize the liquor and vessels containing it. The name of the person so keeping the liquor, if known, shall be designated in the complaint and warrant. If the officer finds the liquors, or believes that such individual has them concealed about his person, he shall arrest him and bring him before the magistrate. If the Court is of the opinion that the liquor was so kept, the keeper shall be fined $100 or imprisoned six months. On every subsequent conviction he shall be fined $100 and such imprisonment. The payment of a U. S. special tax as a liquor-seller or notice of any kind in any place of public resort that liquors are there sold, shall be *prima facie* evidence of common selling (R. S., 1883, c. 27, § 40; amended by Laws of 1887, c. 140, § 8.) When liquors are so seized the officer shall immediately file a libel against them and issue notice to all interested, citing them to appear and show cause why they should not be forfeited. (R. S., 1883, c. 27, § 41.) If no claimant appears, on proof of such notice they shall be declared forfeited. If any one does so appear he shall file his claim, and if the magistrate decides the liquor was not for unlawful sale they shall be restored, otherwise declared forfeited. (Id., § 42.) No warrant shall issue to so search a dwelling-house unless the magistrate is satisfied by evidence that liquor is kept there in violation of law. (Id., § 43.)

All liquors declared forfeited shall be destroyed by pouring them upon the ground and breaking the vessels. (Id., § 44.)

If complaint is made to any magistrate against any claimant that the liquor was kept for unlawful sale, said claimant shall be arrested and on conviction fined $50 or imprisoned three months, and on a second conviction both. (Id., § 45.)

If an officer with a warrant is prevented from seizing liquor by its being destroyed he shall arrest the owner and bring him before the magistrate, and the offender shall be punished as if the liquor had been seized. All appliances for concealing, disguising or destroying liquor shall be seized. (R. S., 1883, c. 27, § 46; amended by Laws of 1885, c. 366, § 5.)

Any person found intoxicated on any highway, and any one intoxicated in his own house or in any place and becoming quarrelsome, disturbing the peace of the public or of his own family, may be arrested by any officer until a warrant may be made. If found guilty he shall be imprisoned five to 30 days; for the second offense, 10 to 90 days. But any portion of such punishment may be remitted if the prisoner gives information where he procured the liquor. (R. S., 1883, c. 27, § 48; amended by Laws of 1885, c. 366, § 6.)

Every wife, child, parent, guardian, husband or other person injured in person, property or means of support or otherwise by any intoxicated person by reason of such intoxication, has an action against any one who sold liquor contributing to such intoxication The owner of premises upon which such sales were made to his knowledge is jointly and separately liable also. (R. S., 1883, c. 27, § 49.)

Liquors seized as herein provided shall not be taken from the custody of the officer by writ of replevin while the proceedings are pending. (Id., § 50.)

Prosecutions for manufacturing, or keeping drinking-houses and tippling-shops, and for being common sellers, shall be by indictment; in all others, municipal Courts and trial Justices have concurrent jurisdiction. Such magistrates may examine and hold to bail in the other cases. (Id., § 51.) Every magistrate or County Attorney having knowledge of a previous conviction shall allege the same on penalty of $100. (Id., § 52.) In appeals the proceedings shall be the same in the higher as in the lower Court, and shall be conducted by the attorney for the State. No portion of the penalty of any recognizance shall be remitted. (Id., § 54.)

Custom-house certificates of importation and proofs of marks on packages corresponding thereto shall not be received as evidence that the identical liquors contained in the package were actually imported therein. (Id., § 55.)

No action shall be maintained on any obligation contracted for liquor sold in violation of this chapter. (Id., § 56.)

Whenever an unlawful sale is alleged, delivery is sufficient evidence of sale. A partner is liable for the unlawful selling or keeping of his co-partner. A principal and his agent may be included in the same complaint. The municipal authorities shall cause suit to be commenced hereunder on any bond in which his town or city is interested. Mayor and Aldermen, Selectmen, Assessors and Constables shall make complaint and prosecute hereunder and enforce the law against drinking-houses. If any municipal officer on notice of a violation of this law, signed by two persons, wilfully neglects to institute proceedings, he shall be fined $20 to $50. (Id., § 57.)

Persons engaged in unlawful traffic in liquors are not competent to sit on juries in cases hereunder. (Id., § 58.)

Proceedings under this chapter are not barred within six years. (Id. § 59.)

Sheriffs shall inquire into all violations of this law and institute proceedings therefor or furnish the County Attorney promptly with the names of offenders and witnesses. (Id., § 60.) County Attorneys shall cause all such witnesses to be summoned before the Grand Jury, and direct inquiries into violations of the law and prosecute offenders. Whenever the Governor is satisfied any County Attorney has wilfully neglected such duty, he shall remove him and appoint another in his place. (Id., § 61.) Upon petition of 30 tax-payers in any county that this chapter is not enforced in the county, the Governor shall appoint two or more constables with powers and duties of Sheriffs for such county. (Id., § 62; amended by Laws of 1885, c. 366, § 7.)

Whoever advertises or gives notice of the sale or keeping of liquors, or publishes any newspaper in which such notices are given, shall be fined $20 (one-half to the complainant). (Laws, 1885, c. 366, § 8.)

It shall be the duty of the Clerk of Courts, within 30 days after adjournment of any superior or supreme judicial Court, to publish in some newspaper of the county the disposition of each appealed case and indictment under the liquor laws. (Laws, 1887, c. 44.)

Supplying liquor to any prisoner, or having liquor in one's possession within any place of confinement with intent to deliver the same to any person confined therein, unless under direction of the physician appointed to attend such prisoner or of the officer in charge, is fined not exceeding $20 or by imprisonment not exceeding 30 days. (Laws, 1889, c. 157.)

There is a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. (Laws, 1885, c. 267.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by vote of two-thirds of all the members of the two Houses, at one session; popular vote to be taken at the next general election for Representatives. A majority carries it.

Maryland.

Colonial Provisions.—In 1642 it was provided that drunkenness should be fined 100 lbs. of tobacco, or if the offender was a servant and not able to pay, he was imprisoned or set in the bilbos, being compelled to fast for 24 hours. (Acts Assembly, vol. 1, p. 159.) By the Laws of 1658 (Id., p. 375), drunkenness was punished by confinement in the stocks six hours, or fine of 100 lbs. of tobacco (half to the informer); for the second offense, by public whipping or fine of 300 lbs. of tobacco; for the third the offender was adjudged infamous and disfranchised three years.

The act of 1662 (Id., p. 447) was to encourage honest persons to set up ordinaries, by giving them an easy way to collect their bills. But by that of 1666 (2 Id., p. 149) their charges were complained of and regulated.

In 1715 carrying liquor to Indian towns was fined 5,000 lbs. of tobacco, and selling over a gallon of spirits in a day to an Indian was fined 3,000 lbs. (Laws, 1759, p. 34.)

A law of 1746 provided that licenses were to be granted by the Justices of each county for 50*s*; in Annapolis, £5. Disorder was not to be suffered, nor were poor persons to be suffered to tipple or game or run up bills over 5*s*. Selling without license was fined £5 (half to the informer). (Id., p. 161.)

A later act provided that the Justices of each county in Court sitting were empowered to grant licenses to keep ordinaries, to persons of good repute in such and so many places as needed them, for the ease and convenience of the inhabitants. travelers and strangers; license fee, £6. Such ordinaries might be suppressed by the Justices for disorder until the next Court, when it should be determined whether to permit continuance. For selling without license, the penalty was 600 lbs. of tobacco. Ordinary-keepers entered into recognizance in 600 lbs. of tobacco to keep good rules and orders, and not allow loose, idle or disorderly persons to tipple, game or commit any disorder. (Killy's Laws, 1780, c. 24.)

Early State Provisions.—Subsequently the penalty for selling without license was placed at £6 (Id., 1784, cc. 7, 37), and appropriated to the University. The recognizance was made £100. Merchants selling over 10 gallons were excepted from the law, and selling on Sunday was fined 40*s.* Licenses were allowed to be granted in vacation of Court by Laws of 1791, c. 58. By Laws of 1806, c. 31, the Justices of the Peace, upon information of unlicensed selling, were to issue warrant for the arrest of such persons and bind them over in £6 to appear at the next County Court. Constables were to make inquiry to the same purpose. By Laws of 1816, c. 193, §§ 14, 15, the Court was given discretion to grant or refuse licenses, and selling without license in Baltimore was fined $24 (half to the informer).

By Laws of 1827, c. 117, licenses to retail liquor were to be issued by the Clerk of each County Court on payment of $12, and in Baltimore $4 additional. But if the Grand Jury signified an opinion that the license ought not to be granted, it could not be.

By Laws of 1845, c. 140, § 3, no person was to sell spirituous liquors in less quantities than a pint without first obtaining license as an ordinary-keeper, under penalty of $50.

Beginning of Local Option and Local Prohibition (1846).—The Clerk of Montgomery County was not to issue license to sell liquor within three miles of the District of Columbia line, or on or near the roads leading from Georgetown to Brookville, Frederick or Seneca Mills, without an order issued by one of the Judges of the Court on his being satisfied from the representations in writing of respectable inhabitants of the neighborhood of the necessity and propriety of granting such license. (Laws, 1846. c. 90.) By c. 283 of Laws of 1854, the Commissioners of the town of East Newmarket were given power to restrict license. From this time on local acts prohibiting sales, submitting Prohibition to vote of districts, towns and counties, and all kinds of local license acts multiplied and became the leading features of the laws, leaving the general license laws much less developed than in any other State. These local laws, as they at present stand, are re-stated under the alphabetical order of names of localities, including counties, in the Public Local Laws of 1888.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—When any person intends to sell spirituous or fermented liquors or lager beer in quantities less than a pint he shall apply to the Clerk of the Circuit Courts or of the Common Pleas of Baltimore for a license therefor. (P. Q. L., 1888, p. 930, § 55 [enacted 1858].) Upon such application he shall state on oath the amount of his stock on hand, or if not previously engaged in that business, the amount he expects to keep. (Id., § 56.) If that amount does not exceed $500 he shall pay $18; if from $500 to $1,000, $35; $1,000 to $2,000, $50; $2,000 to $4,000, $75; $4,000 to $6,000, $100; $6,000 to $10,000, $120; $10,000 to $20,000, $130; $20,000 to $30,000, $140; more than $30 000, $150. (Id., §§ 57-65.) No such license shall be granted for less than $18 unless the person obtains a license to sell goods, paying a license therefor according to the amount of his stock in trade. (Id., § 68.) If any person intends to keep an ordinary and sell liquor by retail, he shall apply to the Clerk for a license. (Id., p. 932, § 67.) He shall pay according to the rental value of his place $25 to $450. (Id., §§ 69-81.) If any person intends to keep an oyster-house, cook-shop, victualling-house or lager beer-saloon, and retail liquor there, he shall apply to such Clerk and pay $50 for each license. (Id., p. 934, §§ 82-83.)

Persons selling liquor without license are fined $50 to $100. (Id., § 84.)

Persons taking out ordinary licenses without hotel accommodations as required, or any persons selling liquor to a minor or to any one to be drunk by a minor, or any person having a license selling to a minor or allowing a minor upon his premises, shall be fined $50 to $200, with suppression of license. (Id., p 935 § 86.)

The Clerk shall not without the special order of the Judge grant a license to any person to sell liquor from whom the Grand Jury has recommended a license to be withheld, or to a person whose license has been suppressed by the Court. (Id., p. 936, § 87.) Any person carrying on a shad, herring or alewife fishery may obtain a license to sell liquors during the fishing season, of the Clerk, for $6. (Id., p. 924, § 25.) Licenses may be granted to sell at horse-races for $4. (Id., § 26.) No license to sell liquors shall be issued by any Clerk to a married woman or minor without special order of the Judge. No Judge shall give such special order without the recommendation of at least 10 respectable freeholders of the ward or district. (Id., p. 927, § 36.)

Section 36, page 926, probably authorizes the licensing of traders in goods to sell liquors by wholesale in quantities not less than a pint, and they are prohibited to so sell without a license upon penalty of $20 to $100 by Id., p. 935, § 85.

In prosecutions for violations of this law relating to liquors, one-half of the fine goes to the informer. (Id., § 88.)

No peddler shall traffic in spirituous liquors in any manner. (Id, p. 926, § 38.)

There is a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. (Laws, 1886, c. 495.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by vote of three-fifths of all the members of the two Houses, at one session; popular vote to be taken at the next general election for Representatives, three months' notice to be given. A majority carries it.

Massachusetts.

The first general regulation of the liquor traffic was made in an order of the General Court that no person should sell either wine or strong water without leave from the Governor or

Deputy Governor, and that no one, except in the ordinary course of trading, should sell or give liquor to Indians. (1 Records of Mass., p. 106 [1633].) In 1637 ordinary-keepers were ordered not to sell either sack or strong water. (Id., p. 205.) Beer-selling was regulated, tippling by townspeople in inns was forbidden, and brewers were required to be licensed. (Id., p. 213 [1637].) In 1638 one person in each of 11 named towns was authorized to retail sack and strong water. (Id., p. 221.) In 1639 retailers of wine were ordered not to allow it to be drunk in their houses (Id., p. 258), and drinking healths was prohibited, under pain of 12*d*. (Id., p. 271.)

Licenses were to be allowed by the quarter Courts; and suffering tippling or excessive drinking was punished, both the keeper of the house and the drinker being fined from 5*s* to 10*s*. (2 Id., p. 100 [1645].)

In 1647 it was provided that County Courts were to grant licenses. (Id., p. 188.) Games were prohibited at licensed places. (Id., p. 195.) Concealing drunken men about licensed premises was fined £5. (Id., p. 257 [1648].) Youths, servants, apprentices and scholars were not to be allowed to spend their time in ordinaries, upon penalty of 40*s*. (3 Id., p. 243 [1651].)

In 1654 allowing tippling and excessive drinking was fined 20*s*, and forfeiture of license for the second offense. (Id., p. 359.)

In 1657 selling liquor to Indians was absolutely prohibited, under penalty of 40*s*. (Id., p. 425.) Unlicensed retailing was fined £5. (4 Id., pt. 2 p. 37 [1661].) The Selectmen were to post drunkards in public houses and prohibit sales to them, and prohibit their frequenting such places, upon penalty of 20*s* and 5*s*, respectively. (Id., p. 463 [1670].) Selling liquor at trainings and other gatherings of the people was prohibited under penalty of £5 (half to the informer). (5 Id., p. 211 [1679].)

Province Laws, c. 20 (1692), was a re-enactment of license provisions.

Frequent acts were passed after 1700, but they were Excise acts and added no new license restrictions, but only provided for collection of the revenue.

The act of 1751 (c. 5, Prov. Laws) included a prohibition to sell to any "negro, Indian or mulatto slave," which was repealed. In 1761 the Justices were allowed to grant a license to a representative of any deceased licensee. (Prov. Laws, 1761, c. 14.)

Early State Provisions.—In 1787 (Laws, Mass., 1780-1807, vol. 1, p. 374) was passed a longer act than any previous one for the regulation of licensed houses. It punished selling without license £20, charged £2 to £6 for licenses, provided for a bond in £20 to observe the law, and prohibited giving a credit for drink of over 10*s* on pain of closing the place. It included most of the former provisions.

Persons not in any incorporated town were allowed to be licensed by the Licensing Court of General Sessions. (2 Id., p. 556 [1792].)

Those aggrieved by the refusal of the Selectmen to approve their applications for license might appeal to the Licensing Court, giving the Selectmen notice. (4 Id., p. 38 [1808].) Confectioners and victuallers in Boston were put upon the footing of innkeepers. (Id., p. 680 [1816].)

Chapter 136 of the Laws of 1831 made the penalty for common selling $30, for single offenses $10. Licenses were put at $5 or $1 for the "soft" liquors. Chapter 166 of the Laws of 1832 repealed all former statutes, included most of the common clauses and imposed penalties of $100 for being an unlicensed common seller, $10 to $20 for each offense. The County Commissioner and Mayor and Aldermen of Boston *might* grant licenses to as many as they decided the public good required. No license fee was required. In 1837 it was enacted that nothing in the last law required the County Commissioners to grant any licenses when in their opinion the public good did not require them. (Laws, 1837, c. 242.) By Laws of 1838, c. 157, no licensed dealer might sell in less quantities than 15 gallons to be carried away all at one time, upon penalty of $10 to $20; but apothecaries and practising physicians might be licensed to retail for medicinal purposes only.

The act of 1838 was repealed by Laws of 1840, c. 1. By Laws of 1844, c. 102, the defendant was presumed not licensed. The word "spirituous" in the liquor laws was replaced by "intoxicating" by Laws of 1850, c. 232, § 1. By the same act the County Commissioners, upon the recommendations of municipal authorities, were authorized to license as many persons as might be desirable for the public good, to sell by retail to be delivered and carried away, for medicinal and mechanical purposes only. (Id., § 2.)

The Maine Law of 1852.—A regular Prohibitory or Maine law was passed in 1852 (c. 322). It provided for penalties of $10 and the giving a bond in $1,000 not to unlawfully sell within one year for the first conviction; $20 and same bond for second, and $20 and three to six months' imprisonment for the third. Giving liquor to prisoners was prohibited by Laws of 1854, c. 93. Sheriffs, Constables, Coroners, executors, administrators and assignees were rendered not liable under the law for their legal sales of liquor at auction only. (Laws, 1854, c. 100.) Several laws in 1855 regulated various single points of procedure. Chapter 356 prohibited adulteration, and c. 470 provided for the appointment of a State Agent in Boston to purchase liquor and sell to town and city Agents; records of purchases and sales to be kept and reports thereof to be made.

The act of 1855, c. 215, took the place of that of 1852 very much elaborating it. The penalties were changed to $10 fine and imprisonment 20 to 30 days for first conviction, $20 and 30 to 60 days for second and $50 and three to six months for third. For manufacturing and being a common seller the first conviction was punished by fine of $50 with three to six months in prison.

The act in relation to single offenses of drunkenness was repealed by Laws of 1861, c. 133 § 1. Civil damages were provided for by § 4 of that act.

The Repeal of 1868.—This Prohibition policy was reversed in 1868. (Laws, c. 141.) A new act provided for County Commissioners' licenses in four classes: Licenses to sell liquor to be drunk on the premises were put at $100; grocers' and druggists' license (not to be drunk on the premises) at $50, and sixth class brewers' and distillers' license (for export) at $100. Unlawful sales were punished by fine not exceeding $500 and imprisonment not exceeding six months. Cities and towns were to vote annually on the question of license. This act contained adulteration and civil damage clauses. By § 22 all licensed vendors were required to keep an account of all liquor purchased by them, and sellers of liquor to be drunk on the premises were taxed 2 per cent. on such liquors; brewers and dealers in malt liquor were taxed 30 cents per barrel, and other licensed persons were taxed 1 per cent.

Prohibitory Law of 1869-75.—By c. 191 of Laws of 1869, all licenses to sell liquor were to have no force after April 30, and by c. 415 of that year the Prohibition law was re-enacted with penalties for unlawful sales beginning with a fine of $10 and imprisonment 20 to 30 days for the first offense. This act provided for license to manufacture for export only, and for a State Assayer. In 1870 the act was amended so as to allow any one to manufacture and sell ale, porter, strong beer and lager beer. (Laws, 1870, c. 389.)

By Acts 1871, c. 334, ale, porter and beer were restored to the prohibition of the law, but cities and towns were to note annually on the licensing of the sale thereof. Chapter 42 of the laws of 1873 repealed the provisions for submitting the question of the sale of beer and left its sale prohibited.

License Act of 1875.—A license law was adopted in 1875 by c. 99 of the laws of that year. It provided for licenses in classes with a license fee of $100 to $1,000 for retailing liquor to be drunk on the premises. It was a comparatively short act, and the usual provisions of a strict license law were added by separate laws during the years ensuing, until the law was revised in 1882, and subsequently by amendments of the Public Statutes of 1882 and further laws added to the laws then existing.

A State Constabulary was constituted in 1871 by c. 394, and it was popularly connected with the liquor law and its enforcement, though the purview of the Constabulary act was not confined to liquor law enforcement, and indeed the liquor laws were not mentioned in it. This Constabulary act also was repealed in 1875. (C. 15, § 14.)

The present Local Option law of Massachusetts, providing for annual votes on the license question by cities and towns, was passed in 1881. (Laws, c. 54.)

Submission of Constitutional Prohibition.—A Constitutional Amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor as a beverage was proposed in 1888 (Laws, p. 566), passed by the next Legislature, submitted and defeated by the people in 1889.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—No person shall sell liquor except as authorized, except that nothing herein applies to sales by a person under a law requiring him to sell personal property, or to sales of cider and of native wines by the makers thereof, not to be drunk on the premises. (P. S., 1882 c. 100, § 1.)

Druggists' licenses may be granted. One or more annually may be granted. Such licensees may sell on Sunday upon prescription. (Laws, 1887, c. 431, § 1.) Sales by them for medicinal, mechanical or chemical purposes only shall be made only upon the certificate of the purchaser, stating the use for which the liquor is wanted, which certificate must be cancelled at the time of sale. (Id., § 2.) A book must be kept of the particulars of each sale, with the purchaser's signature to the entry; and if on prescription, also the name of the physician must be entered. (Id., § 3.) The said book shall always be open to inspection of officers. (Id., § 4.) Persons making a false certificate or prescription shall be fined $10, and a druggist violating this law forfeits his license. (Id., § 5.)

Importers into the United States holding and selling in the original package are exempted from the law. (P. S., 1882, c. 100, § 4.)

In cities and towns which at their annual elections vote for license, licenses may be granted by the municipal authorities. The Boards of Aldermen and Selectmen respectively shall insert the question of license in the warrant for the town or city meeting, and the vote shall be by separate ballot. The City or Town Clerk shall transmit a statement of the vote to the Secretary of State, and also in November a statement of licenses granted and revoked. (Id., § 5.)

No more licenses than one for every 1,000 of population, or in Boston one for every 500, can be granted. (Laws, 1888, c. 340.) No license shall be granted within 400 feet of a public school. (Laws, 1882, c. 220.)

Full notice of application for license must be made, at the expense of the applicant; and if license be granted without the required publication, any citizen may make complaint and have it revoked. (P. S., 1882, c. 100, § 6.) The owner of any real estate within 25 feet of proposed licensed premises may notify the Licensing Board in writing of his objection and no license shall be granted, or if granted may be revoked. (P. S., 1882, c. 100, § 7; amended by Laws of 1887, c. 323.) Licenses may be refused to unfit persons, and nothing in the law is to compel the Licensing Boards to grant licenses. (P. S., 1882, c. 100, § 8.)

Each license shall express that it is subject to the following conditions: (1) That the provisions in regard to the nature of the license and building shall be strictly adhered to. (2) That no sales shall be made between 11 at night and 6 in the morning (1885, c. 90), or on Sunday, except to guests of an inn. (3) That none but good standard liquor free from adulteration shall be sold. (4) That no sale or delivery shall be made to a known drunkard, or to an intoxicated person, or to one known to have been drunk within six months, or to a minor for his own or any other's use, or to one helped by public charity within a year (1884, c. 158). (5) That there shall be no disorder, prostitution or illegal gaming on the premises, or on any communicating premises. Licenses to sell light wines, cider or malt liquors shall be conditioned not to sell spirituous liquors; those to sell to be drunk on the premises, that no public bar will be kept and that the licensee must be licensed as an innkeeper or common victualler, and shall specify the room or rooms in which said liquors may be kept by a common victualler. No person licensed as aforesaid and not licensed as an innholder shall keep or sell any liquors in any room not specified as aforesaid. (6) That the license shall be posted in a conspicuous position on the premises, where it may be easily read. (7) That the license is forfeited for breach of its conditions, and on conviction thereof in any Court. An added condition of license is that no liquor shall be sold election day. (Laws, 1888, c. 262; Laws, 1889, c. 361.) And no common victualler may sell on any holiday, nor may innkeepers so sell except to guests. (Laws, 1888, c. 254.)

No license, except a druggist's. shall be granted to be exercised in any dwelling-house or store having an interior connection with a dwelling or tenement, and such connection makes a license void. (Laws, 1888, c. 139.)

Common victuallers must close between midnight and 5 in the morning. (Laws, 1882, c. 242.)

Licenses shall be of the following classes: (1) To sell liquors of any kind, to be drunk on the premises. (2) To sell malt liquors, cider and light wines containing less than 15 per cent. of alcohol, to be drunk on the premises. (3) To sell malt liquor and cider, to be drunk on the premises. (4) To sell liquors of any kind, not to be drunk on the premises. (5) To sell malt liquors, cider and light wines as aforesaid, not to be drunk on the premises. (6) Druggists' licenses as above (P. S., 1882, c 100, § 10), which shall only be granted to registered pharmacists engaged in business on their own account. (Laws. 1889, c. 270.)

The fees for licenses shall be as follows: 1st class, not less than $1,000; 2d or 3d classes, not less than $250; 4th class, not less than $300; 5th class, not less than $150; 6th class, $1. (P.S., 1882, c. 100, § 11; amended by Laws of 1888, c. 341.)

The Licensing Board may require that no entrances to the premises except from the street be allowed, and that no screens or other obstructions to a view of the interior of the premises be maintained, and that no licensee shall expose to view in any window any bottle or cask or vessel containing liquor to so obstruct a view of the business. (P. S., 1882, c. 100, § 12)

No license shall issue until the fee is paid and a bond in $1,000 given, conditioned to pay all costs, damages and fees incurred by violations of law, such bond to be approved by the Town or City Clerk. (P. S.. 1882, c. 100, § 13; amended by Laws of 1888, c. 283.)

The Treasurer of a city or town shall pay to the Treasurer of the State one-fourth of all license moneys received by him within a month. (P. S., 1882, c. 100. § 14.)

The Mayor and Aldermen of a city, or the Selectmen of a town, or any police officer or constable specially authorized by either of them, may enter the premises of any licensee to ascertain how he conducts his business and to preserve order. And such police officer may at any time take samples for analysis, which shall be sealed in vessels until placed in the analyst's hands. (P. S., 1882, c. 100, § 15)

The Mayor and Aldermen of a city or Selectmen of a town may, after notice and hearing, revoke a license. This disqualifies a licensee to be again licensed for a year. (P. S., 1882, c. 100, § 16.)

A conviction under any of these provisions makes the license void. (Laws, 1887, c. 392.)

No person shall bring into a town in which licenses (except druggists') are not granted. any liquor to be sold in violation of law. This section does not apply to transportation through a town to a place beyond. (P. S., 1882, c. 100, § 17.)

Whoever violates any provision of his license or of this chapter shall be punished by fine of $50 to $500 and imprisonment one to six months, and forfeit his license if licensed. (P. S., 1882, c. 100, § 18; amended by Laws, 1889, c. 114.) When a person holding a license is convicted thus, the Court or magistrate convicting him shall send a certificate thereof to the Board which issued the license. (P. S., 1882, c. 100, § 19.) Such Court or magistrate shall also serve a written notice of such conviction on the owner of the building used by the defendant. (Id., § 20.)

Every husband, wife, child, parent, guardian, employer or other person injured in person, property or means of support by an intoxicated person in consequence of such intoxication, shall have action in damages against those who by selling liquor contributed to or caused such intoxication. and the owner of the building who knowingly permits an unlicensed tenant to so sell. (Id., § 21.) And such owner may recover money so paid, of his tenant. (Id., § 22.) A judgment under § 21 revokes licenses until the judgment is paid. (Id., § 23.)

Whoever sells liquor to a minor for his own or any other's use. or allows a minor to loiter upon his premises where liquor is sold shall forfeit $100 to the parent or guardian of such minor. (P. S, 1882, c. 100, § 24; amended by Laws, 1889, c. 390.)

The husband, wife, parent, child guardian or employer of a person habitually drinking liquor to excess may give notice in writing to any person, requesting him not to sell to such habitual drinker and if he does, may recover $150 to $500. This applies to druggists selling except upon physicians' prescriptions. And the Mayor of a city or any one of the Selectmen of a town may give the notice and sue for the benefit of the injured party. (P. S., 1882, c. 100, § 25; amended by Laws, 1885, c. 282.)

The delivery of liquor from any building, booth or other place except a private dwelling-house. or from such when a part thereof is used as a place of common resort (such delivery being to a person not a resident therein), shall be *prima facie* evidence that such delivery is a sale. (P. S., 1882, c. 100, § 26.)

Signs, placards and advertisements, except in drug-stores, announcing the keeping of liquor, and a United States tax-receipt as a dealer in liquors, shall be *prima facie* evidence that such liquors are there kept for sale. (Laws, 1887, c. 414.)

Ale, porter, beer, cider, wine and any beverage containing more than 1 per cent. of alcohol by volume at 60° F., as well as distilled spirits, shall be deemed intoxicating. (P. S., 1882, c. 100, § 27; amended by Laws of 1888, c. 219.)

The powers of Mayor and Aldermen in cities shall be exercised in Boston by the Board of Police Commissioners, and in any other city the Council may determine that a Board of three License Commissioners, appointed by the Mayor and Council, shall perform such duties. (P. S., 1882, c. 100, § 28.)

The Governor and Council may appoint an Inspector and Assayer of liquors, at a salary of $1,000 yearly (payable monthly), who shall analyze liquors sent to him by officers and whose certificate is evidence. The Court may order analysis by other chemists. (P. S., 1882, c. 100, § 29; Laws, 1882, c. 221; Laws, 1885, c. 224; Laws, 1887, c. 232.)

If two persons make complaint on oath before a magistrate that they believe liquor is kept at a place by a person named, for illegal sale, the magistrate (if he believes the complaint true) shall issue a search-warrant to seize such liquor and the vessels containing it and implements of sale. (P. S., 1882, c. 100, § 30; amended by Laws, 1887, c. 297.) No warrant shall issue to search a dwelling-house (unless a place of public resort is kept therein), unless one of the complainants makes affidavit that he has reason to believe liquor has been unlawfully sold there within a month, stating facts and circumstances. (P. S., 1882, c. 100, § 31.) The place or building to be searched shall be particularly designated. (Id., § 33.) The officer shall search the premises and seize the liquor described, the vessels containing it, and furniture of sale. (Id., § 33; amended by Laws of 1887, c. 406; Laws, 1888, c. 297.) Notice of hearing shall be given, and trial by the magistrate issuing the search-warrant, if the liquor is under $50 in value; by the Superior Court if of more than that value. The liquor and other things seized are forfeited and sold or returned to the claimant thereof according to the result of the trial. (P. S., 1882, c. 100, §§ 34-42; Laws, 1887, c. 53; Laws, 1888, c. 297 and c. 277.)

An officer may arrest without warrant any one found in the act of illegally selling, transporting or delivering liquor, and may seize the liquor and put the culprit in a safe place until warrant can be procured. (P. S., 1882, c. 100, § 43.)

All liquor kept for illegal sale is a common nuisance. (Id., § 44.)

In any No-License town or city, clubs for selling or distributing liquors among members are common nuisances, and the maintainers are liable to $50 to $100 and imprisonment three to 12 months. (Id., § 45.) But in other towns and cities such clubs may be licensed for $50 to $500, if deemed proper organizations. (Laws, 1887, c. 206.)

The Mayor or Selectmen may prohibit the sale of liquors in cases of great public excitement. (Laws, 1887, c. 365.)

Licensing Boards may permit the transfer of licenses upon the same notice, etc., as in granting licenses without new fee. (Laws, 1889, c. 344.)

There is a Metropolitan Police law for the city of Boston, providing that the Governor shall appoint a Board of three Police Commissioners, appointees to be chosen from the two principal political parties and to serve for four years. (Laws, 1885, c. 323.)

There is a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. (Laws, 1885, c. 332.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by a majority of the Senators and two-thirds of the Representatives present and voting; the proposal to be agreed to in the same way by the next Legislature, and the Amendment to be ratified by a majority of the electors when submitted.

Michigan.

Earliest Provisions.—No person was permitted to keep a tavern or retail liquor without a license from three Justices of the district and paying $10 to $25 therefor. Disorder and drunkenness on licensed premises were prohibited. (Terr. Laws, vol. 1, p. 42 [1805].) But the deputy of the Marshal who kept the jail might obtain such license for $1. (Id., p. 91 [1805].)

Persons selling liquor to Indians were fined $5 to $100, with forfeiture of the article the Indian gave for such liquor. (Terr. Laws, vol. 1, p. 180 [passed 1812].)

Permitting disorder by a retailer was fined not exceeding $300 (Id., p. 195 [1816]), retailing without license, not exceeding $100. (Id.)

The tax was raised to $28 where a billiard-table was kept; where one was not, $10 in Detroit and $5 outside. (Id., p. 200.)

No person was to retail without license from three Justices on recommendation of 12 respectable freeholders of the vicinity. Selling without license was fined $10. (Id.) Liquors were not to be given minors or apprentices without written permission of parent, guardian or master, or to any soldier without consent of his commanding officer, or to any Indian without consent of the Superintendent of Indian Affairs, or to any person (travelers and lodgers excepted) on Sunday, on penalty of $10. (Id., p. 201.) In 1822 Detroit was given power to tax and regulate retailers of liquor who were not innkeepers. (Id., p. 254.)

In 1819 was passed a comparatively full license law, vesting the granting of license in the County Courts practically at discretion, and making debts for liquors void. (Id., p. 407.) Prisoners were not allowed liquor except in case of sickness. (Id., 471.)

In 1833 another license law was enacted putting the licensing authority in the hands of Township Boards, to be granted only where taverns were necessary for travelers; there were no other new provisions. (Id., vol. 2, p. 1172.)

Local Option (1845) *and Constitutional Anti-License* (1850).—By No. 46 of the Laws of 1845, at every annual township and charter election the question of license or no-license was submitted to vote.

"The Legislature shall not pass any act authorizing the grant of license for the sale of ardent spirits or other intoxicating liquors." (Const., 1850, art. 4, § 47.)

The act of 1851 (No. 178) provided that any person who might retail any liquor without first giving bond as required should forfeit $25 to $100. A bond in $500 to $1,000 was required of any who should retail liquor, conditioned to pay any penalties and forfeitures incurred by reason of violating any provisions of law regulating the retail of liquor. Those who should sell without first giving bond as required forfeited $25 to $100. Civil damages were provided. This act was upheld as not contrary to the above Constitutional provision, which it was said prohibited granting licenses as a means of revenue but did not interfere with the right of the Legislature to prohibit under heavy penalties the traffic in ardent spirits when conducted in such manner as should corrupt public morals. The statute was said not to be an enabling statute, or to authorize the traffic by granting license. (Langley v. Ergansinger, 3 Mich., 314.)

The act of 1853 (No. 66) submitted to vote of the people a regular Prohibitory or Maine law. The Court was equally divided as to the submission clauses of this act, and it was therefore upheld. (People v. Collins, 3 Mich., 343.)

Maine Law of 1855.—A regular Prohibitory law was definitely enacted in 1855 (Laws. No. 17), with nuisance but not civil damage clauses. The penalties for selling were: first conviction, $10; second, $20; third, $100 and imprisonment three to six months; common sellers and manufacturers were punished by double these penalties.

Manufacturing alcohol, 80 per cent. pure or over, to sell out of the State, and making cider and wine, and the sale of the same in quantities of one gallon or over, and manufacturing beer and the sale thereof in quantities of five gallons or over, not to be drunk on the premises, were excepted from the Prohibitory law. (Laws, 1861, No. 226.)

By Laws, 1871, No. 71, Justices were given jurisdiction under the liquor law; and No. 196 slightly increased the penalties for unlawful selling and gave civil damages. The Laws of 1873 (No. 131) provided that females selling unlawfully were to be imprisoned the same as males. The owner or occupant of any house in which liquors were sold or bought or obtained for money or otherwise, by means of any wheel, drawer, or other device to evade the law, was deemed an illegal seller of liquor. (Laws, 1873, No. 150.)

Repeal (1875).—The Prohibitory laws were repealed by Laws of 1875, c. 228, § 18. That act taxed the business of retailing all intoxicating liquors $150, of retailing malt liquors $50; and persons selling at both wholesale and retail were taxed $300 if they dealt in whiskey, and $100 if they dealt exclusively in malt liquors. Adulteration was prohibited by Act No. 225 of the same year. Act No. 231 made various prohibitions of sale to minors, etc., and gave civil damages. And Joint Resolution No. 21 of that year (Laws, p. 305) provided for repealing the Constitutional provision against license, which was carried by the people.

Act No. 197, Laws of 1877, amended and elaborated the Tax law, but in revenue-collecting matters alone.

The two last-mentioned laws were amended with an increase in tax of $50, by Laws, 1879, No. 268.

Submission of Constitutional Prohibition (1887).—The Legislature submitted a Prohibitory Amendment to the Constitution to vote of the people, by Laws of 1887, p. 466. It did not carry.

At the same session, by Laws, No. 197, under title, "An act to regulate the manufacture and sale of malt, brewed or fermented, spirituous and vinous liquors in the several counties of this State," was enacted a regular County Local Option law; but the Supreme Court decided that the title of the act did not constitutionally express the nature of it. It therefore became inoperative. (*Re* Hauck, 38 N. W. Rep., 269.)

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—The liquor tax rates are: for those manufacturing and selling their product at wholesale, $1,000 per year; manufacturers of malt liquors only, $500; wholesalers, $500; retailers, $500; persons selling all kinds of liquors at both wholesale and retail, $1,000. (Laws, 1889, No. 213, § 1.) Retail dealers are those selling three gallons or one dozen quart bottles or less; wholesalers, those selling over that. No tax is required of any person selling any wine or cider made from fruits grown or gathered in the State, unless sold by the drink. (Id., § 2.)

Druggists who sell liquor for chemical, scientific, medicinal, mechanical or sacramental purposes only, are excepted; but they must keep records of persons applying for liquor, and must give bond in $2,000 not to sell unlawfully. Druggists violating the law are fined $100 to $500 or imprisoned 90 days to a year, or both. (Id., § 3.)

Dealers must annually, on May 1, make and file statements concerning their places and businesses, and pay their taxes. (Id., § 4.) Those beginning business after that date must pay pro rata, but not less than one-half of the yearly tax. (Id., § 5.) The tax-receipt serves as a license, and must be posted as such in the place of business. (Id., § 6.) Persons violating any of the provisions of this law are punished by fine of $50 to $200, or imprisonment 10 to 90 days, or both. (Id., § 7.)

Those engaged in the business must give bonds in $4,000 to $6,000, to be approved by the Municipal Council, not to violate the law, and to pay all damages arising from selling. (Id., § 8.)

Half the moneys received goes to the municipality, the rest to the county fund - except that in the Upper Peninsula all goes to the municipality. (Id., § 9.)

It is the duty of officers and all persons to notify the County Attorney, who shall prosecute violations of the act. (Id., § 10.) Any officer neglecting his duty under this act is fined $100, and the Governor may appoint another to do the duties of his office. (Id., § 12.)

It is unlawful for any one to furnish liquor to any minor, intoxicated person or one in the habit of getting so, to any Indian or to any person when forbidden in writing by husband, wife parent, child, guardian or employer, Director or Superintendent of the Poor. The fact of so selling or furnishing is evidence of intended violation of law. (Id., § 13.) Dealers must not allow minors or students to play cards, dice or billiards in saloons, or sell students liquor except when prescribed for medical purposes. Minors are not to be allowed to visit saloons except when accompanied by parent or guardian. (Id., § 14) Liquor may not be furnished in any concert hall, show, theatre, etc. (Id., § 15.) Saloons shall be closed on Sunday, election days and legal holidays, and after 9 o'clock P. M. and until 7 o'clock the following morning, except that municipal authorities by ordinance may allow saloons to open at 6 A. M. and remain open not later than 11 P. M. (Id., § 16.) Upon complaint that any person is found intoxicated or has been intoxicated in a public place, a magistrate shall issue his warrant for such person, take his disclosure and issue his warrant for the person disclosed as the seller of the liquor if the sale was illegal. (Id., § 17.) Persons selling to a minor are liable to damages not less than $50, and general civil damages are also given. (Id., §§ 18, 20.) Marshals and Chiefs of Police, or some officer appointed by them, shall visit all saloons once every week to see how they are conducted and whether the law is being violated. (Id., § 21.) When complaint is made under this law security for costs shall not be demanded. (Id., § 22.)

Clubs selling or distributing liquor to members are liable to the tax, and the members and employees are liable to the penalties of this act. (Id., § 23.)

Adulteration of liquor with deleterious substances, and selling such liquor, are prohibited under penalty of $50 to $500 or imprisonment 10 days to six months, or both. (Id., § 25.)

Provision is made for the branding of barrels which are filled with liquor. (Id., §§ 26-29.)

Liquors may be compounded by the users or sellers for medicinal and mechanical purposes. (Id., § 30.)

Screens or obstructions to a view from the street shall be removed from saloons during the time when they are required to be closed. (Id., § 31.)

In addition to the branches now required by law, instruction shall be given in physiology and hygiene with a special reference to the nature of alcohol and narcotics and their effect upon the human system. (Laws, 1887, No. 165 [passed 1881].)

The act of 1885 (Laws, No. 217) taxes the business of selling liquors made in the State to be shipped out of the State.

It is unlawful to manufacture, sell or keep for sale any intoxicating liquors after Prohibition as provided in this act; but this does not apply to druggists selling under the general law of the State. (Laws, 1889, No. 207, § 1.) And the general law as to taxation of the liquor business is suspended thereafter. (Id., § 2.)

To ascertain the will of the electors in regard to such Prohibition, upon petition of one fourth of the voters of the county to the Clerk, he shall call a meeting of the Board of Supervisors. (Id., § 3.) To the petition must be attached certified poll-lists of the last preceding election. (Id., § 4.) At the meeting of such Board of Supervisors it shall be finally decided whether the petition is sufficient; and if so, the election shall be ordered—not to be on the day of a general election. (Id., § 6.) The election shall be conducted as a general election, but the proposition shall not be submitted oftener than once in two years. (Id., § 9.) When the result of the vote is for Prohibition, the Board of Supervisors may then, by a majority of all the members elected, vote to so prohibit. (Id., § 13.) And the Prohibition provisions of this act shall after the first day of May following be in force in the county. (Id., § 15.) The first violation of this act shall be punished by fine of $50 to $200, or imprisonment 20 days to six months, and subsequent offences by $100 to $500 fine, and imprisonment six months to two years. (Id., § 16.)

Civil damages are allowed in case of intoxication by liquor sold in violation of the law. (Id., § 19.)

No Board of Registration shall hold sessions in or near places where liquors are sold. (Laws, 1889, No. 23.) No election shall be held in such place. (Id., No. 263, § 28.) Nor shall liquors be brought into the building where such election is being held, or drunk therein by the election officers. (Id., § 29.)

There is a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. (Laws, 1883. No. 93; amended by Laws, 1887, No. 65.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by vote of two-thirds of all the members of the two Houses, at one session; popular vote to be taken at the next spring or autumn election. A majority carries it.

Minnesota.

Earliest Provisions.—The first session of the Legislature provided for granting grocery licenses to retail liquor, by the County Commissioners, at $100 to $200 on delivery of a bond in $500 not to permit disorderly conduct or violate the law. Selling without license was fined $100 to $200, and keeping open Sunday $10 to $25. (Laws, 1849, c. 8.) By c. 7, Laws of 1851, the license fee was put down to $20 to $50, and the penalty for selling without license to $50 to $100.

A regular Prohibitory or Maine law was submitted to vote of the people by Laws of 1852, c. 8. This apparently failed, for it did not become a part of the statutes. The proposed law prohibited the manufacture and sale of spirituous and intoxicating liquors and prescribed penalties of $10 for the first conviction, $20 for second, and $20 and three to six months' imprisonment for the third.

Prohibition in the Sioux Lands (1854).—Manufacturing, selling or introducing liquor west of the Mississippi within the limits of lands lately purchased under the Sioux treaties was prohibited. (Laws, 1854, c. 31.) Outside the said Sioux lands, the County Commissioners were to grant licenses as deemed expedient at $75 to $200, on the giving of a bond in $5,000 not to violate the license. Selling without license was fined $25 to $150, or punished by imprisonment not exceeding six months. (Laws, 1855, c. 48.)

Another general license law reducing the license to $50 to $100, but providing for town, ship Local Option on petition of 10 voters, was enacted in 1858. (Laws. c. 74.)

Selling to minors, wards, servants and habitual drunkards, was regulated by cc. 53 and 54, Laws of 1861. Selling on election days was prohibited by c. 55, Laws of 1865.

The law has not been materially altered since, except by the High License act of 1887, which is incorporated in the General Statutes and the Laws of 1889.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—No one may sell liquor directly or indirectly, in any quantity or for any purpose, to any minor or to any student or pupil, or to any habitual drunkard, or to any intemperate drinker, or to any intoxicated person, on penalty of $25 to $100 or 30 to 90 days' imprisonment. Any employer or relative of any habitual drunkard or intemperate drinker, or anyone injured or annoyed by his continued intoxication, or any relative or employer of any minor, may give notice in writing to any person not to sell to such minor or drunkard; and if he does so sell he shall be fined $50 to $100 and imprisoned 30 to 90 days. Persons procuring liquor for such minors or drunkards shall be fined $25 to $100 or imprisoned 20 to 90 days. No person may sell liquor on Sunday or election days, and licensed places must be closed on those days, on penalty of $30 to $100 and 10 to 30 days in prison. (G. S., 1888, Supp, c. 16, § 10.)

In prosecutions it shall not be necessary to prove the kind of liquors sold. Finding liquors on the premises in question is *prima facie* evidence of their sale thereon; proof that the accused has paid the United States revenue tax and has a receipt therefor posted up is also *prima facie* evidence that he has sold such liquor, but this does not apply to druggists; and in the prosecution of the keeper of a place for violating § 10, proof of furnishing liquor to any minor is sufficient proof of the defendant's knowledge of and liability unless disproved by two witnesses. (Id., § 11; amended by Laws of 1889, c. 105.) In all cases of selling to a minor or drunkard, after notice, the license of the seller is void. (G. S., 1888, Supp., c. 16, § 12.)

Gaming tables in saloons are prohibited, but not billiard and pool-tables, on penalty of $10 to $50. (Id., § 24.)

Licenses must be posted in the room where the business is done. (Id., § 25.) Licenses shall contain a description of the premises, and sales elsewhere are sales without license. (Id., § 26.)

When any person is convicted hereunder, the Court shall send a certificate thereof to the Licensing Board of the district. (Id., § 27.) Any Licensing Board may revoke any license granted by it on proof satisfactory to it of a violation of law, and the party shall be disqualified to receive license for a year, or, if the conviction is of a sale to a minor or drunkard, for five years; and if the licensee is the owner of the premises licensed no license shall be granted thereon for one year. (Id., § 28.) All applications for license shall be signed by the applicant and state the place where the business is to be carried on. The Clerk of the municipality or the County Auditor shall cause notice thereof to be published in the official newspaper two weeks before the hearing. Any person may appear and object to the granting of the license, and if it appear that the applicant has violated the law within a year, or sold to a minor or drunkard after notice within five years, the license shall be refused. (Id., § 29.)

In cities of 10 000 inhabitants or more the license fee shall be not less than $1,000. (Id., § 30.) In other cities license fee shall be not less than $500. (Id, § 31.) In all other places it shall be not less than $500. (Id., § 32.) The term of the license shall be one year, or for a period not beyond 20 days after the next annual election. (Id.) Bond in $2,000, conditioned to sell lawfully and keep a quiet, orderly house, shall be given before license issues. No person may be surety on such bond who is surety on any other such bond. (Id., § 34.) No license shall be issued to any member of any Board of County Commissioners, City Council or municipal corporation who shall take any part in issuing such license upon penalty of $100 to $500 and forfeiture of the license. (Id., § 35.) If any officer neglects or refuses to do his duty under this law, he shall be liable on his bond in $100 to $500. (Id., § 36.) Selling without license is punished by fine of $50 to $100 and imprisonment 30 to 90 days, except druggists' sales on prescriptions. (Id., § 37.) This act applies to all municipalities, anything in their charters to the contrary notwithstanding. (Id., § 38.)

"Intoxicating liquors" means spirituous, vinous, fermented and malt liquors, or either of them. (Id., § 40.)

Evading the laws by means of any artifice known as "Blind Pig" or "Hole in the Wall," or other device concealing the identity of the person selling, shall be fined $25 to $100 or punished by imprisonment 10 days to three months, or both. (Id., § 41)

It is the duty of all officers to arrest any persons found offending against this law and make complaint against them, on penalty of removal. (Id., § 43.)

Pharmacists duly registered may lawfully sell liquors upon a physician's prescription without a license. (Id., § 44.) Any pharmacist violating the law is guilty of selling without license, and if he permits liquors sold to be drunk on his premises he shall be fined $25 to $100. (Id, § 45.) Physicians giving prescriptions to evade the law shall be punished as for selling without license. (Id., § 46.)

All persons licensed to sell intoxicating liquors in this State are required to close their places of business (except hotels) at 11 at night and keep them closed until 5 in the morning, and not to sell liquor during that time. (G. S., 1888, c. 16, § 19; amended by Laws of 1889, c. 87.)

In cities of 10,000 inhabitants or more, no election shall be held in any saloon or barroom, or in any place adjoining, and no liquor shall be introduced into a polling place; nor shall any licensed saloon be opened from 5 in the morning until 8 in the evening of such days. (Laws, 1889, c. 3, §§ 37, 38.) Selling within half-a-mile of the State Fair Grounds during the fair is prohibited on penalty of $100 to $250 for first offense, and $500 to $1,000 or imprisonment 30 days to six months, or both, for subsequent offenses. (Laws, 1889, c. 21.)

No one shall make or offer for sale any adulterated liquor, on penalty of $25 to $100 for first offense and $50 to $100 or imprisonment 30 to 90 days for subsequent offenses. (Laws, 1889, c. 7, § 13.)

Whoever becomes intoxicated by voluntarily drinking intoxicating liquors shall be punished for the first offense $10 to $40, or by imprisonment 10 to 40 days, for the second by imprisonment 30 to 60 days or a fine of $20 to $50, and for third and subsequent offenses imprisonment 60 to 90 days. (Laws, 1889, c. 13.)

There is a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. (G. S., 1889, Supp., c. 36, § 179; passed in 1887, c. 123.)

An Amendment to the Consitution may be proposed by a majority of the two Houses, at one session, such amendment to be published with the laws of the session and submitted to the people, a majority of the popular vote being requisite to its adoption.

Mississippi.

Earliest Provisions.—Every person recommended by six reputable freeholders to the County Court was entitled to receive license from said Court to keep a tavern, on payment of $20 and entering into bond in $300 to keep tavern accommodations and observe the law. He was not to suffer gaming or cock-fighting on his premises upon pain of $8. Retailing liquor without license was fined $10; for the second offense, $20. Merchants might sell above a quart, not to be drunk on the premises. Selling or giving liquor to a servant or slave without consent of his master was fined the same; to United States troops without permission of officer, $20; to Indians, $10; selling adulterated liquor, $20. Drunkenness on the part of the licensee forfeited his license. (Act 1803, revised 1807; Toul. Dig., p. 357.)

By the Laws of 1812, p. 5, the Clerks of the County Courts were to make lists of licenses granted for the Grand Jury. And the fine for selling without license was made not exceeding $100. By the Laws of 1814, p. 9, licenses outside of towns and villages were reduced to $10 and it was made the duty of the Assessors, Tax Collectors and Sheriffs to give information to the Attorney-General of unlicensed sellers.

These acts were consolidated in 1822 (Laws, p. 168), and the Courts were enjoined against licensing taverns not necessary for travellers, and were required to prevent them from being kept for the encouragement of gaming, tippling, drunkenness and other vices. License was put at $15 to $40. Selling without license was fined $20 to $100. It was made the duty of the Court to revoke licenses under which the law had been violated. Credit for liquor above $5 was not collectible.

A law of 1831 provided that licensed dealers in liquors were not to sell to slaves except by the consent, verbal or written, of the masters. (Laws, 1824–31, p. 349.) This was repealed in 1833. (Id., p. 439.)

The State Prohibitory Law of 1839, *Against Sales in Quantities Less than One Gallon.*—In 1839, the liquor laws were all repealed, and liquor was forbidden to be sold in less quantities than one gallon (not to be drunk on the premises). Tavern-keepers were not to offer their guests liquor in any less quantities, and candidates for office were not to bestow liquor on any one. The penalty was fixed at $250 and imprisonment from one week to one month, and for second offenses $500 and one to three months in prison. Liquor was not to be sold in any quantities to Indians or negroes. Tavern-keepers were put under bond in $1,000 not to violate the act. (Laws, 1839, c 20.)

A License Fee of $200 *to* $1,000, *with Severe Penalties* (1842).—By the act of 1842, c. 10, the corporate authorities of places having 2,000 inhabitants or over might grant license to retail liquor for $200 to $1,000 license fee. Outside of such towns the license fee was $50 to $1,000. The penalty for selling without license was $500 and 30 days' imprisonment. The recommendation of five freeholders of the neighborhood was required before license could be granted.

The Era of Local Legislation.—In 1850 began the long series of local acts regulating the sale of liquor, being in character all the way from reducing the license fee for a locality to absolute Prohibition, the great majority being Prohibitory. The law of 1854 (erroneously alluded to in some lists of early Prohibitory laws as a Prohibitory law) amounted to Local Option. (Laws, 1854, c. 42.)

War Legislation.—Distillation of liquor from grain, sugar or molasses was prohibited under penalty of not exceeding $5,000 and imprisonment not exceeding six months. (Laws, 1862, c. 24.) In 1864 distillation from grain, sugar or molasses, fruits and vegetables of any kind, was prohibited. Distilleries were declared nuisances abatable by any white person or officers of the State and Confederate armies. All license to sell liquor was suspended during the war, and such places were declared nuisances, but County Agents were to be appointed to sell liquor for medicinal purposes only, and two distilleries were taken by the State to be run to supply such Agents. All money from the sale of liquor belonged to the State. (Laws, 1864, c. 34.) All officers and employees of the State distilleries were required to give bonds by Laws, 1865, c. 24.

Since the War.—The Laws of 1874, c. 24, provided that no licenses were to be granted without petition of a majority of the male citizens over 21 years old, and of the female citizens over 18, resident in the Supervisor's district or town or city; and if a counter petition of such majority was made against the license, it should not be granted for two years. (Laws, 1874, c. 24.) If a majority of the voters of a Supervisor's district or town or city petitioned against the granting of license therein, none should be so granted for three months. (Laws, 1874, c. 44.) These acts were repealed in 1876. (Laws, c. 81 and c. 40, respectively.)

In 1875 the fees for license were placed at $200, $400, $700 and $1,000, with reference to advantage of situation. (Laws, 1875, c. 28.)

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—It shall not be lawful for any person to sell vinous or spirituous liquor in a less quantity than one gallon without license, although a retail license permits selling in a greater quantity than one gallon. (Code, 1880, § 1097; amended by Laws of 1882,

c. 6.) No person can sell in quantities of one gallon or more without paying the tax and getting the license required by the revenue law. But any person may sell wine made of grapes grown by himself, in any quantity not less than one pint, without license or tax.

If any Supervisors' district or incorporated town shall by a majority of voters petition against it, license to retail liquor therein shall not be granted for a year. (Code. 1880, § 1098; amended by Laws of 1882, c. 6.)

The Board of Supervisors may grant license to retail within the county, but not within any incorporated town or city, for from $200 to $1.000, to go to the School Fund. (Code. 1880, § 1099.) The corporate authorities of any city or town may so grant license, except that in towns of 1.000 inhabitants or more it shall not be for less than $300. (Id., §§ 1100, 1101.) No county, city or town tax exceeding 100 per cent. of the State tax shall be imposed upon the privilege of selling liquors, but the tax herein provided for shall exempt the licensee from all other taxes, provided that the stock may be taxed as other property. (Id., § 1102.)

No license shall be issued without a petition therefor signed by a majority of the legal voters in the Supervisors' district, city or town. After such petition is filed, the matter is to lie over one month and the petition with its signatures is to be published three weeks. A petition of a majority of such voters against the license defeats it for a year. (Id , § 1103.) Before license shall be issued a bond must be given in $2,000, conditioned that the licensee will keep a quiet house and obey the law. On recovery for breach of such bond the informer shall have half. (Id., § 1104.)

No license shall be granted for more or less than one year. It shall not be transferable. It shall designate the particular house in which the liquors may be sold, and sales shall be made in no other; but for sufficient reason the licensing authority may allow a change of such place, and when the licensee dies his business may be continued by his personal representative until his license expires. (Id., § 1105.) The Licensing Board may revoke a license for violation of law by the licensee, or on account of his unfitness, on five days' notice to him. (Id., § 1106.) This act shall extend to all itinerant vendors of liquors and to all steamboats and water-craft, but not to places where the sale of liquor is prohibited by law or regulated by special enactment. (Id., § 1107.)

Any licensee trusting a person for liquors retailed shall lose the debt. (Id., § 1108.)

Merchants and others carrying on any business who sell or give away liquors in less quantities than one gallon shall be subject to the tax on retailers. (Id., § 1109.)

Every magistrate and officer is enjoined to cause this act to be strictly enforced. (Id., § 1110.)

In case of the breach of any bond it is the duty of the District Attorney to bring suit on it, but such suit may be brought by private counsel. (Id., § 1111.)

Anyone selling liquor without license or contrary to law, or any person owning or having any interest in liquor sold contrary to law, shall be fined $25 to $500 or imprisoned from a week to a month, or both. (Id., § 1112.) This does not affect selling native wines. (Laws, 1886, c. 80.)

No one licensed may keep open or sell on Sunday. (Code, 1880, § 1113.)

No indictment hereunder shall be quashed for want of form, and it shall not be necessary to aver the kind of liquor sold. (Id., § 1114.)

If any person sell liquor to any minor he shall be fined $100 to $1.000. (Id., § 1115; amended by Laws of 1882. c. 6, § 3.)

If any candidate shall treat or bestow any liquor on a voter to influence his vote he shall be fined $25. (Code, 1880, § 1116.)

The owner or controller of any house permitting anyone to sell liquor unlawfully therein may be fined not over $500 and imprisoned not more than a month. (Id , § 1117.)

No liquor shall be sold within any prison or brought into it for any prisoner, except upon a permit signed by the physician of the prison for the health of the prisoner. Persons selling and prison officers suffering such sales contrary to law shall be imprisoned not over a year or fined not exceeding $300, or both, and the officer forfeits his office. (Id., § 1118.)

If any person adulterate liquor or sell such liquor he shall be imprisoned from one to five years. (Id., § 1119.)

The County Tax Collectors and Mayors of cities and towns shall on the first day of the Circuit Court furnish the Grand Jury or District Attorney with a list of licensees for the past year, which shall be evidence of the granting or not of license. (Id., § 1120.)

If any seller of liquor permits card-playing or other games of chance upon his premises he shall be fined $500 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both. (Id., § 1121.)

Licensed dealers, or any person who shall sell liquor on election day, shall be fined not exceeding $500 or imprisoned not exceeding six months, or both. (Id., § 1122.)

By the revenue chapter of the Code and the revenue laws of each session of the Legislature, privilege tax is laid on liquor-selling, which is usually $200 or thereabouts; this seems hard to account for, considering the above declaration in the Code that such licenses are not otherwise taxable than as above.

Dealers in liquor in quantities of one to five gallons must comply with §§ 1103 and 1104 of the Code. (Laws, 1884, c. 181.)

Appeals from the granting or refusal of licenses by the Licensing Boards are provided for by c. 16, Laws of 1888.

Procuring liquor for minors is punished by fine of $50 to $500 and imprisonment 10 days to six months. (Laws, 1888, c. 56.)

Upon petition of one-tenth of the voters in any county, it shall be the duty of the Board of Supervisors to submit the question of Prohibition to the voters at a special election held not within two months of a general election. Another such election shall not be held for two years. Selling after Prohibition passes shall be punished by fine not exceeding $50 and imprisonment not over 60 days for first offense, $100 and 60 days for second, and $100 and imprisonment four months for third. Such selling is also a nuisance and may be abated in Chancery Court. All private acts or acts of local application shall be in force until the election herein provided for, and in no case shall this act be construed to repeal any laws prohibiting liquors at Oxford, Starkville, Clinton or at any other place where there may be any institution of learning chartered by legislative enactment where such sale is now prohibited. (Laws, 1886, c. 14.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by vote of two-thirds of all the members of the two Houses at one session; popular vote to be taken at the next general election for Representatives, three months' notice to be given. A majority vote carries it.

Missouri.

Earliest Legislation.—Selling liquor to Indians except by permission of the agents of the United States was prohibited upon penalty of $30 to $150 or imprisonment 10 to 30 days, or both. (Dig. Laws, Mo., 1825, p. 439 [passed 1824].)

A general license law providing a license fee of $5 to $30 for six months, with a penalty of $100 for selling without license, was enacted in 1825. (Id., p. 660.) This law prohibited selling to slaves, without written permit from the owner, under the above penalty, with forfeiture of license. The older act of 1806 had required a tavern license with a fee of $10 to $30 per year, upon penalty of $10 per day while keeping without license; and it also prohibited sales to slaves and United States soldiers without license obtained from the master or commanding officer, respectively. (Id., p. 761.)

In 1835 the license was called a grocer's license, and the fee was made $5 to $100 for six months. (R. S., p. 291.)

The law was slightly enlarged and the fee was changed to $10 to $50 for six months by Laws of 1840, p. 82, and slaves were prohibited selling on pain of 39 lashes.

By an act of 1847, p. 59, persons could not sell liquors by virtue of a tavern license. This was repealed by Laws of 1849, p. 56, and license charges of $20, and $4 per $1,000 upwards, were assessed on property invested above the value of $5,000. County, city and town authorities were authorized to levy no greater amounts than these for their respective purposes. (Id., pp. 56–7.)

Local Option Law of 1851.—In 1851 (Laws, p. 216), whenever a majority of the taxable inhabitants of any city, town or municipal township voted against the granting of any license therein, none should be granted for a year. This virtual Local Option has continued until now, except that it was changed after a while to provide that such a majority should be obtained in a smaller division on every petition for license. From this time forward local acts of a varied nature, prohibiting sales in various places, were passed; but not so extensively as in States farther south.

By an act of 1872 (Laws, p. 48), a special license was created, called the wine and beer license, which cost $10 to $25 per year. It was granted only on petition of a majority of tax-paying citizens, as other licenses were. It was repealed by Laws of 1885, p. 161.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—A dramshop-keeper is a person permitted by law, being licensed to sell intoxicating liquors in quantities not exceeding 10 gallons. (R. S., 1879, § 5435.) No person may so sell without such license. (Id., § 5436.) Dramshop-keepers shall keep but one place. The license is unassignable, and sales on credit are void. (Id., § 5437.)

On application for a license, the County Court, if of the opinion that the applicant is of good character and the petition being sufficient, shall grant the license. (Id., § 5438; amended by Laws of 1883, p. 87, § 1.) Applicants shall give a statement of their stock, upon which the same *ad valorem* tax paid by merchants is paid. (R. S., 1879, § 5439.) Bond in $2,000 to keep an orderly house and not to sell to minors or violate this law, and to pay fines, etc., is required. (Id., § 5440; amended by Laws of 1883, p. 87, § 2.) Upon every license shall be levied, for every six months, $25 to $200 for State purposes, and $250 to $400 for county purposes, the amount to be determined by the Court in each case. (Id., § 5441; amended by Laws of 1887, pp. 178–9.)

No County Court may grant a license in any place of 2,500 inhabitants or more, until a majority of the tax-paying citizens of the block or square petition therefor; in smaller places, until the majority of such citizens of the place sign such a petition. (Id., § 5442; amended by Laws of 1883, p. 87, § 4.)

No license shall be delivered until the applicant produces the receipt of the Collector showing all taxes paid. (Id., § 5445.) The Clerk of the Court may so grant such licenses in vacation of the Court. (Id., § 5446.) Persons violating this chapter are fined $40 to $200. (Id., § 5449.)

The Grand Jury shall be charged with this act; officers shall give information to the Grand Jury and County Attorneys shall take special care to prosecute hereunder and shall also prosecute officers failing in their duty. (Id., §§ 5450-2.)

The authorities of incorporated towns or cities may tax dramshop licenses. (Id., § 5453.)

Selling to minors without permission of parent or guardian shall forfeit $50 to such parents or guardians. (Id., § 5454.) Sales to minors and habitual drunkards by clerks or agents shall be considered acts of employers. (Id., § 5455.)

Dramshop-keepers keeping open on Sunday or election day, or selling on such days, are fined $50 to $200 and forfeit their licenses and may not again be licensed for two years. (Id., § 5456; amended by Laws of 1883, p. 88, § 5.)

Whenever it is shown to the County Court, upon the application of any person, that a dramshop keeper has not at all times kept an orderly house, the license shall be revoked. (Id., § 5457.) And one whose license has been revoked or who has been convicted of violating the law, shall not be licensed by any Court. (Id., § 5458.)

Liquor may be sold where made, but not in less quantity than a quart and not to be drunk on the premises. (Id., § 5459.) Wine-growers may dispose of their wine in any quantity except to minors or to habitual drunkards, without consent or after notice, respectively. (Id., 5460.) Dramshop-keepers selling to habitual drunkards after notice not to are liable in $50 to $500 to the relative giving the notice. (Id., § 5462; amended by Laws of 1883, p. 88, § 6.)

A Local Option election shall be called in any county outside of places having 2,500 inhabitants or more, and in such places upon petition of one-tenth of the voters therein, such petition to be made to the County Court or the legislative assembly of the place, respectively. (Laws, 1887, p. 180, §§ 1, 2.) The question shall not be resubmitted for four years. (Id., § 7.) Violating the act is punished by fine of $300 to $1,000 or imprisonment six to 12 months, or both. (Id., § 9.)

Using any substitute for hops in the manufacture of beer or ale is punished by fine of $500 to $5,000 or imprisonment one to six months, or both. (Laws, 1887, p. 170.)

Physicians giving prescriptions for liquor, except for medicinal purposes, shall be fined $40 to $200. (Laws, 1887, p. 214.)

No merchant's license authorizes selling less than five gallons of liquor nor does it authorize sales of liquor to be drunk on the premises, upon penalty of $100 to $500 or imprisonment three to six months, or both. (Laws. 1887. p. 217.)

Music, billiards, ten-pins, sparring, cockfights, cards and all gaming and amusements are forbidden in dramshops, under penalty of $10 to $50 and forfeiture of license and disqualification 10 years. (Laws, 1889. p. 104.)

There is a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. (R. S., 1889, § 8023; passed in 1885, Laws, p. 243.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by vote of a majority of all the members of the two Houses, at one session; publication of such Amendment to be made in the session laws; popular vote to be taken at the next general election for Representatives, four weeks' notice to be given. A majority carries it.

Montana.

Early Provisions.—At the first session of the Legislature selling liquor to soldiers and Indians was prohibited. (Laws, 1864, pp. 344. 347.) The next session provided a general license law, including all occupations, requiring $30 per quarter for retailers of liquors or $10 per quarter if not within two miles of any town or city. (Laws, 1866, c. 4, § 7.)

The amount of license was gradually increased by the revenue laws. The other present regulations and prohibitions were added by separate laws, and the present High License and Local Option acts were passed in 1887.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—All persons who deal in liquors by retail shall pay as follows: In cities, towns, villages or camps which contain a population of 3,500 or more, $500 per year; in those containing 1,000 to 3,500, $320; in those containing 300 to 1,000, $240, and in those containing less than 300 people, $100. (C. S., 1887, p. 1020, § 1346.)

Applications to sell such liquors shall be made to the County Clerk, stating the place of business, and shall be accompanied by a petition therefor signed by 10 resident freeholders of the town, ward or vicinity; and such Clerk shall give the applicant a certificate to the County Treasurer showing that the provisions of law have been complied with. (Id., § 1347.) The County Commissioners may revoke any such license for violation of law. (Id.)

Any licensee selling to any minor, Indian, insane or idiotic person, or habitual drunkard, or keeping a disorderly house, shall pay $50 (half to the informer) and forfeit his license. (Id.) Every person so licensed selling adulterated liquor shall pay $250. (Id., § 1348.)

Every distiller, manufacturer or rectifier of spirituous liquor shall pay a license of $600 per year. (Id.) Dealers in quantities greater than one gallon in towns of over 3,500 inhabitants shall pay $200, in other places $125. Such persons shall not allow liquor to be drunk on their premises, upon penalty of $50 (half to the informer) and forfeiture of licenses. (Id.) Brewers shall pay from $5 to $20 per month, according to volume of business. (Id., § 1349.)

Doing business without license is fined $10 to $100. (Id., p. 1027, § 1366.)

Upon application by petition signed by one-third of the voters in any county, the County Commissioners shall hold an election to determine whether intoxicating liquors shall be sold therein. Such election shall not be within any month of a general election. (Id., p. 1036, § 1395.) After four weeks' notice of the result of the election, the act shall take effect if the vote is against the sale. A contest of the election is provided for on petition of one-tenth of the voters voting at the election, if made within 20 days. (Id., § 1398.) No such election shall be held oftener than once in two years. (Id., § 1399.) Nothing in this act shall prevent the manufacture, sale and use of domestic wines or cider, or wines for sacramental uses, provided such wine or cider is not sold in barrooms at retail; nor shall it prevent druggists from selling pure alcohol for medicinal, art, scientific and mechanical uses. (Id., § 1402.) Selling contrary to this act is punished by fine not over $500 or imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both. (Id., § 1404.)

Every person who shall erect or keep a booth or other contrivance to sell liquor within one mile of any camp or field-meeting during the holding thereof, shall be fined not exceeding $500. (C. S., 1887, p. 541, § 152.)

Selling liquor to Indians or half-breeds shall be punished by fine of $100 to $500 (half to the informer) and by imprisonment not exceeding three years. Officers may seize wagons, horses and other property used to transport or sell such liquor to such Indians, which is forfeited upon conviction (half to the informer).

Selling liquor to soldiers of the United States subjects the seller to imprisonment not to exceed one year and a fine of $500 (Id., p. 552, § 188), and any soldier putting off his uniform to obtain liquor shall be arrested and held till his commanding officer shall apply for his release. (Id., § 189.) If a person accused of selling to such soldier can show that the liquor was obtained deceitfully, the soldier not being in uniform, he shall not be liable to penalty. (Id., § 190.)

Saloon-keepers permitting minors to resort to their places are fined $10 to $100 or imprisoned one to 30 days, or both. (Id., p. 572, § 241.) Anyone furnishing liquor to anyone in the habit of becoming drunk or of drinking to excess, after notification of such habit, or to any minor without consent of his parent or guardian, shall be liable in damages to those injured thereby, and shall be fined not exceeding $50, or imprisoned not exceeding 30 days, or both. (Id., p. 577, § 257.)

Selling on election days is fined $10 to $100 or punished by imprisonment not more than a month, or both. (Id , § 258.)

It is unlawful to sell or give away liquor in any variety theatre, show or place where theatrical performances are given (Id., p. 578, § 259), or in any place where public dancing is engaged in (Id., § 260), or in any room or place where women or minors are allowed to assemble for the purpose of the business therein carried on (Id., § 261), upon penalty of $100 to $300 or imprisonment 30 days to three months, or both. (Id , § 262.) Establishing or maintaining a saloon or place to sell liquor within two miles of any railroad in process of construction is punished by fine of $20 to $50 for the first offense, and $50 to $100 and imprisonment 10 to 60 days for subsequent ones; but this does not apply to saloons in any incorporated town, village, city or town site where there is a United States post-office. (Id., § 265.)

Employing a child under 16 in a saloon is fined $50 to $100. (Id., p. 589, § 14.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by two-thirds of all the members of the two Houses, at one session; popular vote to be taken at the next general election for Representatives; three months' notice to be given. A majority carries it.

Nebraska.

Prohibitory Law of 1855.—It was by the first Legislature of the Territory made unlawful for any person to manufacture, sell, give away or dispose of any intoxicating liquor to be used as a beverage. The places commonly called dram-shops were prohibited and declared public nuisances. Keeping a place where other persons resorted, even though their own liquor was purchased elsewhere, was, if the liquor were drunk in such place, made within the act. Violating the act was fined $10 to $100 or punished by imprisonment not more than 90 days, or both, and second offenses by $100 or imprisonment not more than a year. (Laws, 1855, p. 158.)

Fraudulently adulterating liquor was punished by imprisonment not more than a year or fine not exceeding $300. (Id., p. 248.) Selling liquor to Indians was punished by fine not exceeding $200 or imprisonment not more than one year. (Id., p. 250.)

Enactment of License (1858).—License was authorized to be granted by the County Commissioners upon petition of 10 freeholders of the township (bond in $500 to $5,000) and payment of $25 to $500 license fee, at the discretion of the Commissioners. Unlicensed sales were punished by fine of $100 to $1,000 or imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both. The usual special prohibitions and full civil damage clauses were included. (Laws, 1858, p. 256.)

In 1861 the license fee was reduced to $15 to $200, and the penalty for unlawful selling to $25 to $100 or imprisonment not exceeding one month. (Laws, 1861, p. 144.)

Selling to Indians was fined $25 to $500, with imprisonment 20 days. (Laws, 1864, p. 88.)

Provision was made that licenses should be under consideration for more than two weeks in the Licensing Boards. (Laws, 1875, p. 24.)

In 1881 was passed the law now in force.

Submission of Constitutional Prohibition and License (1889.)—The Laws of 1889, c. 110, submitted separately these proposed Constitutional Amendments: "The manufacture, sale and keeping for sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage are forever prohibited in this State, and the Legislature shall provide by law for the enforcement of this provision," and "The manufacture, sale and keeping for sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage shall be licensed and regulated by law." Both were defeated.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—The County Board of each county may grant license for the sale of intoxicating liquor, if deemed expedient, upon application by petition of 30 of the resident freeholders of the town or precinct and upon payment of $500; but such Board cannot grant a license in or within two miles of any city or incorporated village. (C. S., 1887, c. 50, § 1.) No action shall be had upon license applications until two weeks' notice of the filing thereof has been given by publication or posting. (Id., § 2.) If there be any objection filed to the license, the Board shall appoint a day for hearing, and if the applicant has been guilty of any violation of the law within a year, or if any former license has been revoked for misdemeanor, then the license shall be refused. (Id., § 3.) On the hearing of any such case, witnesses may be compelled to attend, and their testimony shall be put into writing, and either party may appeal to the District Court which shall try the appeal on the testimony so written alone. (Id., § 4.) License shall not be transferable, and may be revoked by the authority issuing the same upon proof of a violation of the law. (Id., § 5.) Licensees shall give bond in $5,000 not to violate the law and to pay fines and damages adjudged against them. (Id., § 6.) No person can be surety on two such bonds. (Id., § 7.)

Every licensee who sells liquor to a minor, apprentice or servant shall be fined $25. (Id., § 8.) Every such person misrepresenting his age to evade the above section is fined not exceeding $20, or shall be imprisoned 30 days, or both. (Id., § 9.) Any person selling to any Indian, insane person, idiot or habitual drunkard shall forfeit $50. (Id., § 10.) Selling without license is punished by fine of $100 to $500, or by imprisonment not exceeding one month, besides the amount assessed on account of liability on the bond. But persons may sell wine made from grapes grown by them, in quantities not less than one gallon. (Id., § 11.) The magistrate, upon complaint under the last section, shall upon examination bind the party over to the next term of the District Court if he believes him guilty. (Id., § 12.)

Every licensee disposing of adulterated liquors intentionally shall forfeit $100. (Id., § 13.)

Selling on Sundays or election days is fined $100. (Id., § 14.)

All damages the community or individuals may sustain in consequence of the traffic, including the support of paupers, widows and orphans, shall be paid by the licensed persons responsible. (Id., §§ 15, 19.)

The County Board may grant permits to druggists to sell liquors for medicinal, mechanical and chemical purposes without license fee. (Id., § 24.)

The corporate authorities of all cities and incorporated villages have power to license, regulate and prohibit the sale of liquor, for a fee of not less than $500 in places up to 10,000 inhabitants and not less than $1,000 in larger places. They may grant druggists' permits The petition for license must be signed by 30 or a majority of the resident freeholders of the ward or village. (Id., § 25.)

Every druggist having a permit must keep an itemized register of his sales showing date, kind, quantity, purpose and name of vendor, open to the inspection of the public, upon penalty of $20 to $100 and imprisonment 10 to 30 days. (Id., § 26.) Anyone making a false statement to procure liquor of any person authorized to sell the same shall be fined $10; on second offense, $20, with imprisonment 10 to 30 days. (Id., § 27.)

Any person found in a state of intoxication is guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be fined $10 or imprisoned not more than 30 days, but upon disclosing when and where he obtained the liquor the penalty may be remitted. (Id., § 28.)

Saloons shall be kept unobstructed by screens, blinds, paint, etc., upon penalty of $25 or imprisonment 10 days, or both, with forfeiture of license. (Id., § 29.) Treating in saloons is prohibited under penalty of $10 or imprisonment 10 days, with $15 for attorney fees. (Id., §§ 31–2.)

No person shall sell liquor within three miles of any assemblage of people for religious worship, except at regular places of business, upon penalty of $20 to $100. (Id., §§ 33, 35.)

In cities of the first class there shall be an Excise Board consisting of the Mayor and two members elected by the city at large. (Laws, 1889, c. 14, § 13.) Such cities by ordinance may restrain, prohibit and suppress unlicensed tippling-shops. (Id., § 67, ¶ 37.) The Excise Board has exclusive control of the licensing and regulation of the sale of liquor, and shall meet once a month. It may license, regulate or prohibit the sale, and determine the license fee, not to be less than the general law imposes. Special permits to sell liquor for medical and mechanical purposes may be granted to druggists, to be revoked at pleasure. And licenses may be revoked by such Board for violations of law or ordinance. Such Board may make all needful rules and regulations as ordinances, not inconsistent with the general law, and may compel the attendance of witnesses. The penalty for selling without license is $200. (Id., § 91.) In such cities of the first class as have less than 25,000 inhabitants, the Mayor and Council may by ordinance license, restrain, regulate or prohibit the sale of liquor, grant permits to druggists and revoke licenses and permits. Selling without license therein is fined $100. (Laws, 1889, c. 15, § 92.)

It is unlawful to keep liquor for the purpose of sale without license, and those found in possession of such liquor, with the intention of disposing of the same unlawfully, shall be punished as in § 11. This does not apply to physicians and druggists holding permits, or persons having liquors for home consumption.

If any reputable freeholder of any county makes complaint under oath before a magistrate that he believes liquor (describing it as nearly as may be) is in any described place, owned or kept by a named or described person, intended to be sold unlawfully, said magistrate shall issue his warrant to search the premises, seize the liquor, arrest the person and bring him before the magistrate; and possession is presumptive evidence of a violation of law, unless upon examination the defendant satisfactorily accounts for the same. Liquor seized shall not be discharged by reason of any insufficiency of the complaint or warrant, but the claimant is entitled to an early hearing upon the merits of the case. If the place to be searched is a dwelling the complaint must allege an unlawful sale there within 30 days. (Laws, 1889, c. 33, § 1, to be C. L., c. 50, § 20.) If upon examination the accused is found guilty he shall be held for trial to the next District Court, and the liquor shall be destroyed, but defendant may appeal to the District Court, when the liquor shall abide the result. (Id., § 2, to be Id., § 21.) If the defendant is acquitted he shall be discharged and the liquor returned to him. If guilty he shall pay $25 to the prosecuting attorney, besides the fine and costs. If the defendant is discharged the prosecuting witness shall pay the costs, unless there was probable cause for the complaint. If no one is found in possession of the liquor, notice shall be posted upon the premises fixing a hearing within five to ten days, the liquor to abide the result whether any one claim it or not. (Id., § 3, to be Id., § 22.)

Liquor shall not be taken into any place of registration or drank therein, upon penalty of $100 to $500. (Laws, 1889.)

There is a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. (C. S., 1889, p. 659, § 5*a*; passed in 1885, c. 83.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by vote of three-fifths of all the members of the two Houses, at one session; popular vote to be taken at the next general election for Representatives, three months' notice to be given. A majority of all voting at said election carries it.

Nevada.

By the Revenue act of the first session of the Legislature, in 1861, the tax on liquor licenses was put substantially as it has remained in the Revenue laws since passed. The laws now in force have been enacted at different times, but the policy of the law has not changed.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—Wholesale licenses obtained of the Sheriff, authorizing sales of liquors in quantities of a quart or over shall cost from $2.50 to $50 per month, in 10 classes, according to volume of business. (G. S., 1885, § 1139.) Retail licenses are obtained from the Sheriff also and cost $10 per month, but persons retailing in connection with the entertainment of travelers, one mile or more outside the limits of any city or town, pay quarterly $15. No person under such license can sell on election days. (Id., § 1140.) Any person selling liquor without a license shall be fined $25 to $200. (Id., § 4696.)

It is unlawful to retail liquor within one-half mile of the State prison, upon penalty of $50 to $500 or imprisonment 25 days to six months. (Id., § 4729.)

Every person selling liquor to minors or mental imbeciles without written or verbal order from parent or guardian shall be fined $25 to $100 or imprisoned not exceeding 60 days. (Id., § 4730.)

Selling to Indians is subject to fine of $100 to $500 or imprisonment one to six months, or both. (Id., § 4732; amended by Laws of 1887, c. 30, to a fine not exceeding $1,000 or imprisonment not exceeding two years, or both.)

Treating to liquor in any public barroom is punished by fine of $4 to $20 or by imprisonment two to ten days, or both. (Id., § 4740.)

Licenses shall be posted conspicuously in the place of the business, or $10 to $100 be forfeited. (Id., § 4822.)

Anyone knowingly selling any adulterated liquor shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than six months. (Id., § 4677.)

None (hotel-keepers excepted) may keep open a place for selling liquor between 12 P. M. and 6 A. M., upon penalty of $200 to $500 or imprisonment 30 days to six months, or both. (Laws, 1889, c. 72.)

There is a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. (Laws, 1885, p. 115.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by majority vote of the two Houses, to be concurred in by majority of each House in the next Legislature; a majority of the popular vote carries it.

New Hampshire.

Colonial Provisions.—Permitting inhabitants of the town to remain in public houses drinking Saturday night or Sunday was in 1700 fined 5*s*, both for the drinker and the keeper of the house. (Laws, 1696–1725, p. 7.) In 1701 drunkenness was fined 5*s*. (Id., p. 14.)

Taverners were not to allow apprentices, servants or negroes to sit drinking in their houses, nor townsmen after 10 o'clock, upon penalty of 10*s*, nor to suffer excessive drinking, upon penalty of 5*s*. Tything-men were to be elected in each town to inspect licensed houses, and such houses were to be limited to six in Portsmouth and smaller numbers in other places. (Id., p. 57 [1715].)

Reputed drunkards were to be posted in taverns, and sales were not to be made to them, upon penalty of 20*s* (half to the informer). (Id., p 142 [1719].) Selling without license was was fined £5 (one-third to the informer).

Early State Provisions.—By the law of June 14, 1791 (Laws, N. H., Portsmouth, 1792), no person could exercise the business of taverner or retailer without license obtained from the Selectmen of the town, and if he did so sell liquor he forfeited 40*s*. Taverners were not to suffer inhabitants of the town to tipple in their places after 9 o'clock in the evening, or on the Sabbath, or suffer any person to drink to drunkenness, or any minor or servant to sit drinking without consent of his parent or master, on penalty of 20*s*. They were not to allow gaming either. Retailers were not allowed to sell liquor to be drunk on the premises, on penalty of 40*s*, nor were they to sell in less quantities than one pint. License was again placed at 3*s*, and taverners were not entitled to recover more than 20*s* on action for liquor sold to be drunk on their premises.

Chapter 86 of the Laws of 1820 provided that the license should designate the particular house or store in which the business was to be conducted, and that it should not avail in any other place. The Selectmen were to post in liquor-places the names of common tipplers, and forbid sales of liquor to them, on penalty of $10. Breaches of the law in general were placed at $10 instead of 40*s*.

The law of 1827, c. 65, punished selling without license by fine of $20 to $50, and placed the license fee at $2 to $5 for a taverner, with 20 cents for recording. Licenses to sell and mix wine and spirituous liquors were allowed to others than tavern-keepers for $20. The Selectmen who granted license might revoke the same if licensee kept a disorderly house or violated the law.

The licenses to others than tavern-keepers were not allowed by the act of 1829, c. 27.

The penalty for selling without license was changed to $25 to $50 by Laws of 1838, c. 369.

By c. 530, Laws of 1847, the question whether it was expedient for the Legislature to pass a law prohibiting the sale of liquors except for chemical, medicinal and mechanical purposes, was to be voted upon at the next annual town meeting.

By c. 846, Laws of 1849, the Selectmen of the respective towns were to license one or more suitable persons to sell liquor for medicinal, mechanical and chemical purposes and for no other use or purpose. Selling without such license was punished under existing laws.

Prohibitory Act of 1855.—The Prohibitory act of 1855 (Laws, c. 1658) prohibited the sale only (not the manufacture). It is still in force. The law of 1858 (c. 2080) added provisions for appointing a State Agent, which remain in force. By the act of 1878 (c. 16) lager beer was added to the list of those liquors prohibited, but the act was to be in force only in towns so deciding by majority vote. The submission clause was repealed by c. 102, Laws of 1881.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—The Governor shall appoint one or more suitable persons to furnish Agents appointed by towns with unadulterated spirituous liquors. (G. L., 1878, c. 109, § 1.) Such person must give bond to the State in $10 000. (Id., § 2.) Agents of towns must buy of such State Agent and no other. (Id., § 3.) Town Agents must not adulterate liquors they keep, and must not purchase of any one but the State Agent, upon penalty of $50. (Id., § 4.) One or more Agents, not exceeding three, shall be appointed by the Selectmen of each town (except such as have voted no such appointment shall be made) for the sale of spirits, who may be removed at pleasure of the Selectmen. No inn-keeper or keeper of a place of public entertainment, and no person who has been convicted of violating this chapter, shall be so appointed. (Id., § 6.) Such Town Agent may sell spirituous liquor to be used in the arts and for medicinal, mechanical and chemical purposes. and wine for the sacrament only. (Id., § 7.)

Persons buying liquor who make false statements regarding the use for which such liquor is intended shall be fined $10, for the second offense $20. (Id., § 8.)

Agents shall receive such compensation as the Selectmen prescribe, not to be dependent on the amount of sales. (Id., § 9.) Agents shall keep, and when required, exhibit to the Selectmen or any Justice of the Peace an accurate account of all purchases and sales, showing in the latter case the name of the purchaser and the use for which he said the liquor was purchased. (Id., § 10.) Such Agent shall sell at the rate of profit determined by the Selectmen and make report to them annually of his purchases and sales and amounts remaining on hand. He shall at any time exhibit to the Selectmen or any Justice of the Peace his bills, receipts and papers of all kinds relating to his dealings. (Id., § 11.) Each Agent shall receive a certificate of his appointment. which shall be recorded with the Town Clerk, and if he violate the rules prescribed for him by the law or Selectmen he shall be fined $50, and for any subsequent offense $50 and imprisonment not exceeding 90 days. (Id., § 12.)

If a person not a Town Agent sell or keep for sale any spirituous liquor he shall be fined $50, and for a subsequent offense $100 or be imprisoned not exceeding 90 days, or both. (Id., § 13.) If any such person be a common seller of such liquor he shall be fined $100 and be imprisoned not more than six months. (Id., § 14.) If any such person sell cider in less quantities than ten gallons (except when sold by the manufacturer at the press, or in an unfermented state, or lager beer, beer or malt liquors not already prohibited), he shall be fined $10, and for subsequent offenses $50. (Id., § 15.) The delivery of under ten gallons of cider shall be deemed *prima facie* evidence of sale. (Id., § 16.)

If any person solicit orders for liquor to be delivered at any place outside the State for transportation within the State, to be sold in violation of the law, he shall be fined $50 and upon any subsequent conviction $100 or imprisoned not more than 90 days. (Id., § 18.) If such person go from place to place so soliciting orders he shall be fined $100 or imprisoned not more than 90 days. (Id., § 19.)

A Justice or Police Court has jurisdiction to sentence after final judgment if the defendant plead guilty or waive his right of appeal; otherwise he may bind him over to the next term of the Supreme Court. (Id., §§ 20-22.) In any complaint it shall be sufficient to allege the first offense only, and any process under this chapter may be amended on motion. (Id., § 23.)

The delivery of liquor in any place used for traffic or place of public resort is *prima facie* evidence of sale. (Id., § 24.)

Exposing signs or bottles with liquor labels, or United States special tax-receipt as a liquor-dealer, in any place of business, is *prima facie* evidence of violation of the liquor law. (Id., § 25.) No clerk or agent of an accused person shall be excused from testifying on the ground that he might criminate himself, but his evidence shall not be used against him. (Id., § 26.)

The Selectmen of every town shall prosecute at the expense of the town any person violating this law, and on neglecting to do so shall be fined not more than $200. But this does not prevent any person from making complaint and prosecuting such cases; and in any case the prosecutor, whether town, city or individual, is entitled to half of every fine collected. (Id., § 27.)

If the husband, wife, parent, child, brother, sister or any near relative, guardian or employer of any person who has the habit of drinking to excess notifies anyone in writing not to sell to such person, the one giving the notice may recover $50 to $500 in damages from the person notified, if he so sells. (Id., § 28)

Spirituous liquor kept for unlawful sale may be seized upon warrant issued by a Justice or Police Court, and upon due proceedings adjudged forfeited. If the liquor is adjudged valuable it will become the property of the county and may be sold to Town Agents to sell. (Id., § 29.)

Nothing herein shall prevent the sale of domestic wine or cider, except when sold to be drunk on the premises, nor shall it prohibit sales by importers into the United States in the original packages. (Id., § 30.)

If any person be drunk in any public place or in any private place disturbing his family, he shall be arrested and detained until sober and then fined not exceeding $10 or be imprisoned until he discloses the name of the one who sold him the liquor. (Id., § 31.) Parties selling liquor are responsible for injuries resulting therefrom. (Id, § 33) Persons permitting their premises to be occupied for illegal selling shall be fined not more than $200. (Id., § 34.)

It is the duty of County Solicitors to prosecute al. offenses against this act without delay or indulgence to offenders. (Id, § 35.) No indictment shall be found hereunder unless the offense was committed within one year therebefore. (Id., § 36.)

Liquor-sellers illegally selling are exempted from jury duty. (Laws, 1887, c. 44.) Whoever knowingly brings into or transports within the State any intoxicating liquor to be illegally sold or kept for sale, is to be fined $50 or imprisoned 30 days, or both. (Id, c. 53)

Any building . . . resorted to for . . . or used for the illegal sale or keeping for sale of spirituous or malt liquors, wine or cider, is declared a common nuisance; and the Supreme Court upon information filed by the County Solicitor or petition of 20 voters of the town or city may enjoin or abate the same (Laws, 1887, c. 77.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed only through revision by a Constitutional Convention. Once every seven years the electors shall decide by majority vote whether such a Convention shall be called. Amendments proposed by such a Convention must be approved by two-thirds of the voters voting.

New Jersey.

Colonial Provisions.—In 1668 persons found drinking after 9 o'clock were apprehended and punished at discretion. (Leaming & Spicer, p. 80.) Drunkenness was fined 1*s*, 2*s* and 2*s* 6*d*, for the first, second and third offenses respectively. (Id., p. 84.) Every town was ordered to provide an ordinary, and no person was allowed to sell liquor but the ordinary-keeper under penalty of 10*s*. (Id., p. 87.)

In 1677 selling to Indians was fined 20*s*. (Id., p. 125.) The charges of ordinary-keepers for liquor were modified. (Id., p 128)

In 1678 sales to Indians were fined £20, doubled for each subsequent offense (one-third to the informer), with 20 stripes if the offender could not pay. (Id., p. 137.)

A law of 1688 provided that ordinary-keepers were to be licensed by two Justices and give bond in £20 to keep orderly houses. Selling without license was fined £10 (one-third to the informer). (Id., p. 317.)

Early State Provisions.—In 1797 an act concerning inns and taverns (R. S., 1821), provided for licensing liquor-selling therein upon recommendation of resident freeholders. Such licenses to be only as many as were needed for accommodation of travelers. The Court of Quarter Sessions was to grant such licenses (upon bond, with two sureties in $50 each, to obey the law), and to assess thereon such sum as they thought proper, taking into consideration desirability of location. Permitting gaming and disorderly conduct and selling to drunkards, minors and slaves, were prohibited upon pain of forfeiture of license. The act of 1820 (Id., p. 744) required the recommendation of 12 freeholders to procure license, and fined unlicensed selling not exceeding $20.

Township Local Option (1847).—There were no important additions or changes made to this code, except the Sunday prohibition of 1848 (Laws, p. 183) and the election day prohibition of 1857 (Laws, p. 1013), until 1888. There had been, however, a Local Option law passed in 1847 (Laws, p. 158) giving townships the opportunity to vote for license or no-license, and to vote any year thereafter on the subject upon petition of one fourth of the legal voters. This was repealed the next year (1848) by Laws, p. 150. There were also three or four local Prohibitory acts during this period.

The law of 1888, c. 110, provided means for revoking license and for County Option on the question of prohibiting the sale of liquor, on petition of one-tenth of the voters of the county once in three years, and increased the license fee to $100 in townships, and $250 in cities.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—The last act was repealed by Laws of 1889, c. 53. This provided that license to retail should not be granted by any Court or Excise Board except upon payment of $100 in municipalities having less than 3,000 inhabitants, $150 in those having from 3,000 to 10,000, and $150 in larger ones. Selling without license is punished as keeping a disorderly house. (Laws, 1889, c. 59, § 1.) Licenses to sell from one quart to five gallons must be obtained in the same way and at the same rates as the retail license. (Id., §§ 2, 3.) Upon petition of one-fifth of the voters in municipalities wherein licenses are required to be granted by the Court of Common Pleas of the county (this then does not apply to any of the larger cities), the question of a named minimum license fee, not less than required by law to be charged in such municipality, may be submitted to vote of the people therein. Such petition is to be addressed to and granted by the law Judge of the county, the election to be ordered within 30 days, but not to be held within 60 days of any general election, not less than two or more than five months from the making of the order. (Id., § 4.) Three weeks' notice of such election, next preceding the election, shall be published in all the newspapers of the municipality, and such other notice given as the Judge shall deem necessary. The election shall be conducted as a general election and return thereof shall be made within five days to the County Clerk. (Id., § 5) Ballots shall be "For $— license fee," and "Against $— license fee," naming the amount stated in the petition for the election. (Id., § 6) Thereafter no license shall be granted for that place for less fee than that fixed at such election. (Id., § 7.) Such election shall not be oftener than once in three years in the same place. (Id., § 8.)

The Board of Councilmen of any incorporated town in the State shall have power to pass ordinances to license, regulate and prohibit the sale of liquor; to fix the terms of license not less than now required by law, and to prescribe penalties not exceeding $50 fine or 10 days' imprisonment for violating any ordinance hereby authorized. (Laws, 1888, c. 179, § 1) Such ordinances shall receive four-fifths vote of the whole number of members of the Council, be laid over to the next meeting and then receive such four-fifths, and each ordinance shall be published 10 days in a newspaper published in the county, and shall be so posted in 20 places. (Id., § 2.)

All fees for licenses granted by the Court of Common Pleas shall be received by the County Clerk and by him transmitted within 30 days to the Treasuries of the respective municipalities in which license is exercised. (Laws, 1889, c. 59, § 9.)

When the holder of a license shall unlawfully sell or allow to be sold within his place any liquor on Sunday, or to any minor or apprentice, or to any person known in the neighborhood to be of confirmed intemperate habits or who is visibly under the influence of liquor, or shall keep a disorderly house, or harbor drunken persons, thieves, prostitutes or other disorderly persons, or suffer gambling or unlawful games of chance or other unlawful acts to be done upon his premises, or violate any law respecting intoxicating liquors, his license shall become forfeited and void. And upon complaint of any three voters of the municipality, upon oath, presented to the licensing authority, alleging such forfeiture and specifying the acts complained of, such body shall endorse on such complaint an order that the accused show cause within 10 to 30 days why his license should not be revoked. A copy of such complaint shall be served personally or by leaving the same at the residence, tavern or licensed place of the accused, at least five days before the return of the order. All such complaints shall be heard in a summary way, the burden of proof being upon the complainants, and either party may be represented by counsel. If upon the hearing the defendant is found guilty, his license shall be revoked and he be disqualified to hold one for a year; if not guilty the order to show cause shall be discharged. The Court making the order to show cause may require the complainants to file a stipulation for costs, which must be paid by them if unsuccessful The remedy provided by this section is in addition to other penalties provided by law. (Id., § 10.)

No license shall be granted in any store or place where any grocery-store or other mercantile business is carried on, except in a restaurant or in a place selling tobacco and cigars by retail. Any such person so selling contrary to this section is guilty of keeping a disorderly house. (Id, § 11.) Druggists may retail liquors if in good faith compounded or sold, for medicinal purposes only, upon physicians' prescriptions (not to be drunk on the premises). Offending herein is keeping a disorderly house. (Id., § 12)

Whenever upon any trial under this act it is alleged that any spirituous, vinous, malt or brewed liquor has been sold, it is not necessary to prove the particular kind. (Id., § 13.)

If any person has been twice found guilty of keeping a disorderly house, he shall be forever thereafter disqualified from having a license. (Id., § 14.)

It was enacted that if any part of the above act should be declared unconstitutional, the rest should stand unaffected. (Laws, 1889, c. 227.)

Excise Boards in cities are authorized to transfer or revoke any license granted by them, at their discretion. In case of transfer on the removal of the licensee, there shall be paid a fee of $5. (Laws, 1889, c. 226.) To prevent violation of the law, such Board in any city may appoint a License Inspector at not exceeding $1,000 per year. (Id., § 2.)

Boarding-house keepers are forbidden to sell liquor to be drunk on the premises without a liquor license, upon penalty of fine not exceeding $1,000, or imprisonment not exceeding two years, or both. (Laws, 1888 c, 30.)

Prosecutions under this act shall be before the Recorder or other police magistrate of the town. (Laws, 1888, c. 179, § 3.)

No intoxicating liquor shall be sold or given in any quantities to any minor under 18 years of age by any dealer in such liquor, nor shall such minor be allowed to lounge in or frequent such premises. (Laws, 1888, c. 196.)

Clerks of the Court of Common Pleas are required to keep records in the minutes of the Court of licenses granted by such Courts, and report to the Court the names of those who refuse to take out and pay for their licenses, and thereupon such licenses shall be revoked. (Rev. Supp., 1886, p. 384, § 5.)

Probably the only part of the former law not inconsistent with or practically duplicated by the above summarized laws of 1888 and 1889, is § 1 of Rev., 1877, p. 486, vesting the ordinary licensing authority in the Court of Common Pleas (except, of course, in cities and places that have licensing boards of their own by charter). Whatever provisions of the old law may upon comparison be found to be operative, are not of importance.

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by vote of a majority of the two Houses; to be concurred in by a majority of each House in the next Legislature; a majority vote of the electors carries it.

New Mexico Territory.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—License taxes, half of which shall be for Territorial and half for county purposes, shall be imposed as follows: On all wholesale dealers in intoxicating liquors in quantities of more than five gallons, $100; on retail dealers, $40; brewers, $60; distillers, $200. (C. L., 1884, § 2901.)

No officer of any prison shall deliver liquor to any prisoner unless upon certificate of a physician (Id., § 471), upon penalty of $25 to $50, and disqualification for his office on second conviction. (Id., § 472.) If any other person so deliver liquor to a prisoner he shall be fined $5 to $25. (Id, § 841.)

If any person sell liquor to a minor without consent of the parent or guardian, or to an intoxicated person, he shall be fined $5 to $50. (Id., § 841.)

Selling liquor without license is fined not exceeding $500. (Id., § 842.)

Adulterating liquor or selling the same is fined $5 to $50. (Id., § 843.)

Any saloon-keeper trusting any minor for drinks does so at his own risk; he has no action therefor. (Id., § 852.) Any saloon keeper permitting minors to play billiards, cards or any other game on his premises, shall be fined $10 to $100. (Id., § 853.) Selling or giving liquor to minors under 18 years of age, by one not the father or guardian, is punished by fine of $10 to $50, or imprisonment not exceeding 60 days. (Id., § 855.)

Delivering liquor to Indians under charge of agents is punished by fine of $20 to $100, or by imprisonment not exceeding three months. (Id., § 856.)

Selling on election day is illegal and punished by fine of $25 to $100, or by imprisonment 20 to 30 days (half of the fine to the informer). (Id., §§ 857-8)

Selling to any Indians excepting Pueblo Indians is fined $5 to $200. (Id., § 859.)

Any saloon-keeper permitting games, cards or dice upon his premises shall be fined $50 to $300. (Id., § 881.)

Municipal corporations have the right to license, regulate or prohibit the sale of liquor and determine the amount of license, and to grant permits to druggists to sell for medical and similar purposes, and to punish sales to minors, insane, idiotic or distracted persons, habitual drunkards and intoxicated persons. (Id., § 1622.)

Every husband, wife, child, parent, guardian, employer or other person, injured in person, property or means of support by any intoxicated person who is a habitual drunkard, or in consequence of such intoxication, shall have action against the sellers of the liquor causing the intoxication, if such plaintiff has before given the seller notice not to sell to such habitual drunkard. (Laws, 1887, c. 20.)

New York.

Colonial Provisions.—The Duke of York's Book of Laws, "digested into one volume for the public use of the territories in America under the government of His Royal Highness, collected out of the several laws now in force in His Majesty's American colonies and plantations, published March 1, 1664, at a general meeting at Hempstead upon Long Island," and there on file, was introduced into Pennsylvania, Sept. 22, 1676. It, with the laws from 1682 to 1700, is published in one volume (Harrisburg, 1879), to which reference is made below.

Brewers were required to be skilled in the art, and if any one sold unfit or unwholesome beer, damage might be recovered of him. (Id., p. 13.) No person should at any time under any pretence or color whatsoever undertake to be a common victualler, keeper of a cookshop or house of common entertainment, or public seller of wine, beer, ale or strong waters by retail, or a less quantity than a quarter cask, without certificate of good behavior from the constable and two Overseers, at least, of the parish wherein he dwelt, and license first obtained under the hand of two Justices of the Peace, in the sessions, upon pain of forfeiting £5 for every such offense, or imprisonment at the discretion of the Court.

"Every person so licensed for common entertainment shall have some ordinary sign obvious for direction of strangers, within three months after the license granted, under the penalty of 20*s*. Every person licensed to keep an ordinary shall always be provided of strong and wholesome beer of four bushels of malt, at the least, to a hogshead, which he shall not sell at above 2*d* the quart under the penalty of 20*s* for the first offense, 40*s* for the second and loss of his license. It is permitted to sell beer out-of-doors at a penny the ale-quart or under. No licensed person shall suffer any to drink excessively or at unreasonable hours, after 9 of the clock at night, in or about any of their houses upon penalty of 2*s* 6*d* for every offense if complaint and proof be made thereof. If any quarrel or disorder doth arise from intemperate persons within their house, the person so licensed, for not immediately signifying the same to the constable or one Overseer at the least, who are authorized to cause the peace to be kept, shall for every such neglect forfeit 10*s*; and every person found drunk in or about any of their houses shall forfeit 2*s* 6*d*, due for being the author or accessory of the breach of the peace and disorders, or for tippling at unseasonable hours shall forfeit 10*s*, and for want of payment, or in case they be servants and neglect their masters' occasions, they shall be sent to the stocks one hour at the least. It shall be lawful, notwithstanding, for all licensed persons to entertain land-travellers or seafaring men in the night season when they come on shore or from their journey, for their necessary refreshment or toward their preparation for their voyage or journey; and also all strangers, lodgers or other persons may freely continue in such houses, when their lawful occasions and business doth require, provided there be no disorder amongst them. Every person so licensed for the entertainment of strangers with their horses, shall provide one or more enclosure for summer, hay and provender for winter, with convenient stable room and attendance, upon penalty of 2*s* 6*d* for every day's default, and double damage to the party thereby wronged. No licensed person shall unreasonably exact upon his guest for any sort of entertainment, and no man shall be compelled to pay above 8*d* a meal, with small beer, only unless the guest shall make other agreement with the person so licensed.

"No license shall be granted by any two Judges in sessions for above the term of one year; but every person so licensed before the expiration of the said term shall and are hereby enjoined to repair to the sessions of that jurisdiction for renewing their several licenses, for which they shall pay to the Clerk of the sessions 2*s* 6*d*, or else they shall forfeit £5 as unlicensed persons. All offenses committed against this law shall be determined by the constable with two or more of the Overseers, who are empowered to collect and receive the several fines or distrain in case of non-payment, rendering account thereof as is elsewhere required." (Id., p. 30.)

Selling or delivering strong liquor to Indians was fined 40*s* a pint, and in proportion for greater or lesser quantities (one-third to the informer); except that by way of relief or charity to any Indian in case of sudden sickness, faintness or weariness, the quantity of two drams might be sold or given, provided that the Governor might license persons to sell such liquor to Indians upon security for their good behavior. (Id., p. 32.) No man was hindered from buying for his own private use any quantity of liquors, provided he did not sell by retail without a license. (Id., p. 59.)

In 1665 it was provided that inn-keepers should not be obliged to put any particular quantity of malt into their beer, but should not sell it above 2*d* a quart, or any liquor above 12*s* a gallon, under penalty of 20*s* a gallon so sold. If any complaint were made to the officers of a town against selling of liquors at too unreasonable and extraordinary rates, by ordinary-keepers or others, such officers had power to give redress. (Id., p. 64.)

Selling liquor to Indians, as well as trading with them, was prohibited throughout the government (New York), and the law was likewise to be observed which prohibited selling strong liquors to the Indians in Yorkshire on Long Island and dependencies. (Id., p. 75.)

Thus far the Duke of York's laws, which were in force from 1676 to 1682 as well in Pennsylvania as in New York.

In 1697 frequenting tippling-houses was included as a profanation of the Sabbath and fined 6*s*. (Baskett's Laws, p. 24.) In 1709 drunkenness was fined 3*s*. (Id., p. 89.) In the same year selling liquors to Indians in Albany County was prohibited. (Id., p. 110.)

In 1710 an excise was laid on liquor retailed. (Id., p. 125.) An excise was laid of one-eighth of an ounce of silver for each gallon of strong liquors, and one-third of an ounce on every barrel of beer and cider retailed throughout the colony. The Justices or Mayor and Aldermen might agree upon a sum equal to the excise to be paid by the year, and license the retailer, or make him enter into recognizance to pay the excise.

In 1712 selling without license was fined £5; to slaves, 40*s*. (Bradford's Laws, p. 89.)

In 1720 imported wine paid 7½ oz. of silver per pipe, and distilled liquor 15 grains per gallon. (Id., p. 186.)

In 1745 tavern-keepers were not to keep gaming-tables, under penalty of £20, nor permit youths, servants, apprentices or journeymen to game, under penalty of £3, and such persons were fined £6 for gaming. (Van Schaack's Laws, vol. 1, p. 253.) Selling liquor to servants and apprentices was fined 40*s*, and so was taking from them clothes or pawns in payment. And tavern-keepers were not to give credit for over 6*s* for liquors, except to travellers. (Id., 286 [1750].)

In 1772 a license, to be granted by Justices at a cost of 5*s*, with a penalty of 20*s* for selling without, was provided for Cumberland County (2 Id., p. 645), extended to Gloucester County (p. 805 [1773]). This was the territory now Vermont. The Excise Commissioners appointed in the act were to impose £1,000 upon the dealers in New York City, and the other Commissioners were to appoint the several retailers and determine what each should pay, not less than 20*s* annually, except at the Court House, in Suffolk County, and not including those retailing not to be drank on the premises. (Id., p. 741 [1773].) Tavern accommodations were provided for in nine counties, but the Justices might make exemptions in places of little resort, and forfeiture of license was provided for selling to apprentices, servants or slaves without consent. (Id., p. 798 [1773].)

Early State Provisions.—Supervisors of cities, towns and districts, and the Mayor of Albany were to act as Commissioners of Excise, and were to grant licenses to retail liquor at rates of $2 to $4 per month, to be assessed as excise duty, with a charge in each case of 16*s* as a fee of the Commissioners. The applicant was required to have a certificate of character from the two nearest Justices of the Peace and six substantial freeholders of the place. Selling without license forfeited £10. The Commissioners were to determine the prices of liquors, victuals and lodging, which were to be posted conspicuously. (Laws, 1779, c. 17.)

Revolutionary Prohibition of Distillation.—In the same year (1779), distillation from grain was prohibited upon penalty of £200 fine. (Id., c. 18.)

The Laws of 1780, c. 40, provided that licenses were to be granted only to such as had sufficient ability to keep inns. A bond in £300 conditioned not to suffer cock-fighting or gaming was required. Unlicensed selling was fined £100 (half to the informer). A fee of $11 for license and $5 for each recognizance was required to be paid the Commissioners.

The act of 1781, c. 27, made the license fee £2 to £8, and reduced the penalty for selling without license to £10 (half to the informer), and the bond to £50. By the Laws of 1784, c. 37, a Commissioner of Excise for New York City and County was to be appointed by the Mayor and Common Council, who was to grant licenses at from £1 to £20.[1]

The act of 1788 (Laws, c. 48) codified and extended the law, repeating former laws. Only taverns necessary to the public were to be licensed, as before, half the penalties going to the informer.

Sale of liquor on Sunday was prohibited, except to lodgers and travellers. (Laws, 1798, c. 82.)

Merchants licensed were not to allow the liquor sold to be drunk where goods were sold, and they were required to keep inns also. (Laws, 1799, c. 78.)

The Laws of 1801, c. 164, taxed licenses at $5 to $30, fined illegal sales $25, and made the bond $125.

In 1820 Overseers of the Poor were given the authority, and it was made their duty, to prosecute for penalties under the liquor laws for the benefit of the poor. (Laws, 1820, c. 37.)

First Local Option (1845).—The electors of each town or city were to determine the question of license or no-license by ballot, which vote was to stand until another was taken upon petition of one-fourth of the voters. New York City was excepted. (Laws, 1845, c. 300.) By the Laws of 1846, c. 14, this was changed to an annual vote, at spring elections. These acts were repealed by Laws of 1847, c. 274.

If the Overseers of the Poor neglected for ten days to prosecute under the Excise laws, any one might do so. (Laws, 1854, c. 285.)

Prohibitory Law of 1855.—Chapter 231 of the Laws of 1855 was a law prohibiting the sale and keeping of liquors for any purpose, except as a medicine or for sacramental, chemical and mechanical purposes. Violators forfeited their liquors. The penalties for keeping liquors were: first offense, $50 fine; second, $100 fine and 30 days' imprisonment; third, $100 to $200 and three to six months. The penalty for selling was $100 fine, imprisonment for 30 days and disqualification to sell afterward. In Wynehamer v. People (13 N. Y., 378) this law was declared unconstitutional, because liquor possessed at the time of the enactment was not excepted from its prohibition, and because jury trials of offenses thereunder might be denied.

The Law of 1866, c. 578, was a complete license code for the Metropolitan Police District, leaving out the requirement for tavern accommodations. It was repealed in 1870.

---

[1] The license rates given in this paragraph were subsequently reduced by revision. By the revision of 1828, the license fee was placed at $5 to $30 (1 R. S., 1828, p. 678, § 4), and the penalty for selling without license at $25. These fees and this penalty were the same in the 4th edition of the Revised Statutes of 1852, and they remained in force until the enactment of the Prohibitory law of 1855.

The Law as it Existed in 1889.—The Law of 1857, c. 628, is still given as law in Burdsaye's edition of the Revised Statutes, 1889, and in Bank's 8th edition. I abstract what is given in the latter at p. 2226, and following, taking the last sections passed where there are conflicting regulations therein.

There shall be a Board of three Excise Commissioners in each municipality. In incorporated villages it shall consist of the President of the Board of Trustees, and two other Trustees, to be designated by the Board itself. (Laws, 1870, c. 175, § 1; 8th ed., p. 2235.) In cities the Mayor and Aldermen shall appoint such Commissioners. (Id., § 2.) But in New York City these are now, as city officers, appointed by the Mayor without confirmation. In Brooklyn the head of the Department of Police and Excise is appointed by the Mayor, with two other Commissioners of Excise to serve with him. (Laws, Brooklyn, p. 49, §§ 1, 2.) At the annual town-meetings shall be elected the Commissioners of Excise, one each year. (Laws, 1874, c. 444; 8th ed., p. 2239.) These Commissioners meet on the first Monday of May in each year for the purpose of granting licenses, and at no other time, except upon application for license in any town or village not oftener than once a month, and in cities the first Monday of each month, or oftener, if necessary. Licenses expire the first Monday in May, except in New York, Brooklyn and Rochester, where they expire a year after their date. (Laws, 1870, c. 175, § 3; 8th ed., p. 2237.)

Licenses may be granted for $30 to $150 in towns and villages, and for $30 to $250 in cities. The license must be conspicuously posted in the place of sales. Persons not licensed may sell in quantities not less than five gallons, not to be drunk on the premises. (Id., § 4.)

Licenses do not authorize sales between 1 and 5 o'clock in the morning, and saloons must be closed then. (Id., § 5.) Violations of the liquor laws forfeit licenses, and Excise Boards after hearing shall revoke and cancel the same. (Id., § 8.)

In cities of over 150,000 inhabitants, licenses may be granted to those not keeping inns, and those denied license by the Board may apply to a Judge of a Court of record of the city for a writ of mandamus to review the action of the Excise Board, and if the application for license was arbitrarily rejected the Judge may order the Board to issue it. (Laws, 1885, c. 340, § 1; 8th ed., p. 2241.) Such Board may authorize the removal of the place of the licensed business in such cities. (Id., § 2.) No licensed persons or their agents in such cities may be arrested without warrant, except between 1 A.M. and 12 P.M. on Sunday, for violations of the law in the presence of any officer. And such officer may so arrest those engaged in the unlicensed sale of liquor in such cities. (Id., § 3.) Tavern accommodations are required as under the very old laws, except in such cities. (Laws, 1857, c. 628, § 6; 8th ed., p. 2229.)

Bond in the penal sum of $250 shall be taken that the licensee will not allow disorder or gaming. (Id., § 7.)

There shall be no recovery for liquor sold on credit. (Id., § 10; 8th ed., p. 2230.)

Licenses to retailers, not to be drunk on the premises, were provided for, with bond in $500 and a $50 penalty for allowing consumption on the premises. (Id., §§ 11–14; 8th ed., p. 2230.)

Sales to apprentices, knowingly, or to minors under 18 without consent of master or parent or guardian, are fined $10, and sales to Indians or minors under 14, $25. (Id., § 15; 8th ed., p. 2230.)

Any officer shall arrest any one violating the act and take him before a magistrate, who shall try him if he so elect, or if the offense be drunkenness or otherwise shall bind the offender over to the next sessions or to the Oyer and Terminer. (Id., § 16; 8th ed., p. 2231.)

Those found intoxicated in a public place shall be fined $3 to $10, or imprisoned 10 days to six months. (Id., § 17.) No one shall sell liquor to an intoxicated person, under penalty of $10 to $25. (Id., § 18; 8th ed., p. 2232.)

Magistrates and Overseers of the Poor, upon complaint of a wife, husband, parent or child, that the husband, wife, child or parent, respectively, is a habitual drinker, shall notify dealers not to sell liquor to them for six months, under penalty of $50. (Id., §§ 19, 20.)

No one shall sell liquor on Sunday, or within a quarter of a mile of any election on election day, upon penalty of $30 to $200, or imprisonment five to 50 days, or both. (Id., § 21.)

Penalties shall be sued for by the Overseers of the Poor, or where there are none, by the Board of Excise. (Id., § 22; 8th ed., p. 2233.)

Every bond under this act shall be filed within 10 days in the Municipal Clerk's office. (Id., § 23.) Whenever there is a breach of such bond, the Excise Board, the Supervisor, Mayor or Trustees of the municipality shall prosecute the same. (Id., § 24.) Whenever any conviction or judgment shall be obtained against any licensed person, the Court shall transmit a statement of the same to the next Court of sessions. (Id., § 25.) The said Court shall on notice proceed to revoke the license. (Id., § 26.) Persons whose licenses have been revoked cannot again receive licenses for three years. (Id., § 27.)

Any person selling to a person to whom sales are forbidden is liable for all damages to the party injured. (Id., § 28.) Courts shall instruct Grand Juries to inquire into violations of this act, or adulterations of liquors, or selling such, the latter being punished by imprisonment three months and fine of $100. (Id., § 29.)

Private parties may prosecute under this act after 10 days' notice to those whose duty it is to so prosecute. (Id., § 30; 8th ed., p. 2234.)

Companies or persons carrying passengers must not employ intemperate persons. (Id., § 31.)

"Every husband, wife, child, parent, guardian, employer or other person who shall be injured in person or means of support by any intoxicated person, or in consequence of the intoxication, habitual or otherwise, of any person, shall have a right of action in his or her name against any person or persons who shall, by selling or giving away intoxicating liquors, have caused the intoxication in whole or in part of such person or persons; and any person or persons owning or renting or permitting the occupation of any building or premises, and having knowledge that intoxicating liquors are to be sold therein, shall be liable, severally or jointly, with the person or persons selling or giving intoxicating liquors aforesaid, for all damages sustained and for exemplary damages; and all damages recovered by a minor under this act shall be paid either to such minor or to his or her parent, guardian or next friend as the Court shall direct; and the unlawful sale or giving away of intoxicating liquors shall work a forfeiture of all rights of the lessee or tenant under any lease or contract of rent upon the premises." (Laws, 1873, c. 646; 8th ed., p. 2239.)

Introducing liquor into any poor-house, juvenile reformatory, protectory, house of refuge, jail, penitentiary or prison except upon requisition of the medical officer thereof, or the allowing the use of such liquor therein by any officer thereof, except upon such prescription, is a misdemeanor. (Laws, 1880, c. 429; 8th ed., p. 2240.)

Selling liquor at State and county fairs, except in cities of over 500,000 inhabitants, is fined $50 to $500. (Laws, 1888, c. 35; 8th ed., p. 2244.)

Allowing children under 16, unaccompanied by parent or guardian, in any place where liquors are sold, or permitting them to play games therein, or selling or giving liquor to such children, is a misdemeanor. (Laws, 1889, c. 170.)

An elaborate act regulating wines, "half wines" and made wines, and prohibiting adulteration of wines, was passed in 1887. (Laws, c. 603; 8th ed., p. 2242.) It does not regulate the making and sale in a restrictive way, but rather the contrary.

There is a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. (1 Burdsaye's R. S., p. 596, § 287; passed 1887, Laws, c. 30.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by a majority vote of the two Houses, to be concurred in by a majority of each House in the next Legislature; a majority vote of the electors carries it.

North Carolina.

Colonial Provisions.—An act concerning tippling-houses was passed in 1715, and an additional one in 1770. A duty on liquors was laid in 1734. Persons getting drunk on Sunday were fined 5*s*; on any other day 2*s* 6*d*.

In 1741 it was provided that all persons retailing liquors should sell the same by sealed measures, according to the act for regulating weights and measures. Persons retailing liquors without license were to forfeit £5. The County Court was to judge whether a proposed house was convenient and the keeper responsible, and was to grant or reject the prayer for license. The licensee was to give bond in £30 not to permit gaming or suffer any one to tipple more than necessary on the Sabbath. The license cost 25*s*. Two Justices might suppress the license for violations of law until the next Court, which should continue the suppression or restore the license. The Justices were to fix ordinary rates, which were to be posted in the house, and over-charging was punished by fine of 10*s*. Keeping a tippling-house contrary to the act was fined £5, or in default 30 lashes, and on the second offense the same fine was imposed, or 39 lashes and imprisonment one month. This act did not hinder merchants or persons from selling not less than a quart to be drunk out of the house. (Swann's Laws, p. 152 [1741].)

A revenue act of 1754 (Davis's Revisal, p. 155) laid a duty of 4*d* per gallon on imported liquors.

The act of 1778 (2 Martin's Laws, p. 122) provided in the same way as above for license at a cost of 20*s*. Selling without license was fined 48*s* and to slaves without permit £5. The provision for suppression was omitted.

Early State Provisions.—By the act of 1798, c. 18, licenses were granted for 40*s*. Retailing without license was fined 48*s*.

By the last two acts the license was to be granted if the person were not of gross immorality or of too small means, and it was even provided that upon payment of the license fee there should be no necessity for formal license.

In 1825 this tax was fixed by the Revenue act at $4 for retailers, as it was taken to be for tavern-keepers. (R. S., 1857, p. 516, §§ 20, 21.)

By the act of 1844 (Laws, c. 86), no free negro or mulatto might sell liquor in any way to any person, under penalty of $10 for the first offense and fine and imprisonment at discretion for a second offense.

The Revenue law of 1854 (Laws, c. 37) taxed retailers of liquor $20; that of 1856 (Laws, c. 34), taxed them $30, while that of 1858 (Laws, c. 25), taxed liquor brought into the State 10 per cent. ad valorem. In these last two years were passed the first of the local Prohibitory laws; there were but few of them enacted before the Civil War, and none at all during the war; but after the war their numbers increased rapidly at each session.

War Provisions.—An act was passed in 1862 (Laws, c. 10) prohibiting all distillation under penalty of $500 and imprisonment 60 days. This act referred to the ordinance of the Convention prohibiting for a limited time the distillation of liquor from grain. It was extended to malting or brewing by Laws of 1864, c. 30.

Since the War.—By the Revenue law of 1866 (Laws, c. 21, § 16), the license of retailers was raised to $50. Selling liquor on election days was prohibited by Laws of 1868, c. 26. By Laws of 1881, c. 319, Prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor was submitted to the people and defeated.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—Every one selling intoxicating liquors or medicated bitters in quantities of five gallons or less shall pay $50 for six months, to be collected by the Sheriff for the benefit of the school fund of the county; in quantities of five gallons or more, $100; for malt liquors exclusively, $10 for said period. Nothing in this section prevents any person selling spirits and wines of his own manufacture at the place thereof in quantities not less than a quart. Every one wishing to sell liquors shall apply to the Board of County Commissioners for an order to the Sheriff to issue a license, stating the place at which it is proposed to conduct the business. The Board, upon satisfactory proof of good moral character, shall issue such order except in territory where the sale of liquors is prohibited. Counties may levy not more than as much tax as the State does hereunder. All persons licensed shall post their licenses in some public part of their places of business. The license shall be printed as the Treasurer of the State shall prescribe, and furnished by the Register of Deeds to the Sheriff. Persons not posting their licenses will be considered doing business without license. Licenses taken out after Jan. and July 1 will be subject to the full amount for six months. (Laws, 1889, c. 216, § 32.)

Every person bringing liquor into the State to sell shall, in addition to the ad valorem tax on his stock, pay as a license tax one-half of 1 per cent. of such purchases. (Id., § 23.)

For selling without license the seller shall forfeit not exceeding $20 per day. (Code, 1883, § 3704.)

Any person giving or selling liquor on election days within five miles of any polling-place at any time within 12 hours next preceding or succeeding any election, or during the holiday thereof (except for medical purposes upon prescription), shall be fined $100 to $1,000. (Id., § 2740.)

Any person bringing into or selling liquor within the Penitentiary enclosure, not authorized by the physician for the use of the hospital, and the prison officer suffering it, shall be fined not more than $50 or imprisoned not more than 30 days; and if an officer, shall be dismissed. (Id., § 3440.)

Selling liquor (except by licensed dealers at their regular places of business) within a mile of and during the progress of divine service, is fined $20. (Id., § 3671.)

Liquor shall not be sold within four miles of Chapel Hill. (Id., §§ 2640–3.)

All wines made from fruit raised in the State may be sold in bottles corked up, in any quantities, not to be drunk on the premises, but must not be sold to minors; nor may wines mixed with spirituous liquor be so sold. (Id., § 3110.)

Notice of all applications to the General Assembly to prohibit the sale of liquor or to repeal Prohibitory local laws within the limits specified, shall be posted at four public places within those limits for at least 30 days before the application shall be forwarded to the General Assembly. (Id., § 3111.) In all cases where Prohibition is asked for a greater distance from a common center than two miles, the question shall be decided by the votes according to this chapter. (Id., § 3112.)

The County Commissioners, upon the petition of one-fourth of the voters of any county, town or township, shall order an election to be held on the first Monday in June in any year to ascertain whether spirituous liquors shall be sold therein; but such election shall not be held oftener than once in two years. (Id., § 3113; amended by Laws of 1885, c. 336, and Laws of 1887, c. 215, § 1.) Such election shall be held under the general election law. (Code, 1883, § 3114; see Laws, 1887, c. 216, § 2.) At such election ballots shall be "Prohibition" and "License," respectively (Code, 1883, § 3115.) If Prohibition carries, no license shall be granted in such limits until the vote is reversed, provided that liquor-dealers shall have six months in which to close out their businesses, if their licenses shall remain so long in force. (Id., § 3116; amended by Laws of 1887, c. 215, § 3.) If in a county election the vote is in favor of license, that result shall not operate to permit sale in any township, city or town where it is prohibited by law, unless that place cast a majority of votes for license. (Code, 1883, § 3117.)

No druggist shall sell or dispose of any intoxicating liquor except for medical purposes upon prescription of a practicing physician known to such druggist to be reputable, and no physician shall give a prescription to a drugstore in which he is financially interested. Any druggist or physician violating this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and fined or imprisoned at the discretion of the Court. (Laws, 1887, c. 215, § 4.)

If anyone adulterate liquor or sell such liquor he shall be fined or imprisoned, or both, at the discretion of the Court. (Code, 1883, § 982.) Any citizen after purchasing liquor may cause the same to be analyzed, and if found to contain any foreign poisonous matter it shall be *prima facie* evidence against the party making the sale. (Id., § 983.) Any person offering to sell any recipe for adulterating liquor shall be punished as above at discretion. But druggists, physicians and persons engaged in the mechanical arts may adulterate liquor for medical and mechanical purposes. (Id., § 984.)

If any person shall retail liquor in any other manner than is prescribed by law, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and punished at the discretion of the Court. (Id., § 1076.)

Dealers selling to unmarried minors knowingly are guilty of misdemeanors. (Id., § 1077.) The father or (if he be dead) the mother, guardian or employer of such minor has a right to a civil action against the seller for damages not less than $25 and for exemplary damages. (Id., § 1078.)

Selling liquor within two miles of public political speaking is fined $10 to $20. (Id., § 1079.)

If anyone sells liquor on Sunday except upon a physician's prescription he is guilty of a misdemeanor and may be punished at the discretion of the Court. (Id., § 1117.)

The Sheriff shall lay before the Grand Jury as soon as it assembles a list of the persons licensed to retail liquor within two years. (Id., § 1087.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by a three-fifths vote of the two Houses, at one session; popular vote to be taken at the next general election for Representatives. A majority vote carries it.

North Dakota.

Present Law (1890).—No person, association or corporation shall within this State manufacture for sale or gift any intoxicating liquor, and no person, association or corporation shall import any of the same for sale or gift, or keep or sell or offer the same for sale or gift, barter or trade, as a beverage. The Legislative Assembly shall by law prescribe regulations for the enforcement of the provisions of this article, and shall thereby provide suitable penalties for the violation thereof. (Const., art. 20, § 217.)

The Prohibitory law passed by the first Legislature of the State, to go into effect July 1, 1890, is substantially as follows:

Any contravention of the Constitution as above is punished for the first offense by fine of $200 to $1,000 with imprisonment 90 days to one year; for subsequent offenses by imprisonment one to two years, being a felony.

But registered pharmacists may sell intoxicating liquors for medicinal, mechanical and scientific purposes, and wine for sacramental purposes, as hereinafter provided. (§ 1.) Selling for such purposes is unlawful until a druggist's permit therefor is procured from the County Judge. This he may grant if the person is of good character and can be entrusted with the responsibility. The applicant must file a petition signed by 25 reputable freeholders (voters), and 25 reputable women over 21 years old, residents of the town, village, township or city. He gives bond in $1,000 to obey the law. Any permit so granted must be revoked upon hearing the same as when granted, and upon petition of the same number of persons. If the County Judge wrongly issues such a permit he shall be fined $500 to $1,000, and if any signer of a petition for a permit knows its statement to be false he is fined $50 to $100. (Id., § 2.) Any physician, when a patient is absolutely in need thereof, may give a prescription for liquors for him, and giving it otherwise is punished by fine of $300 to $800 with imprisonment 30 days to six months. (§ 4.) Sales by permit-holders are made upon printed affidavits minutely specifying the intended uses (only one sale to be made upon one affidavit), the affidavits themselves being officially furnished and duplicates kept, so as to check sales. Persons making such affidavits falsely are imprisoned as for perjury six months to two years. And if one sign a false name he is guilty of forgery in the fourth degree and imprisoned one to two years. Re-selling liquors obtained upon affidavit is punished by fine of $100 to $500 with imprisonment 30 to 90 days. Any druggist holding a permit who fails to make the record of sales for inspection required, or falsely sells an affidavit, or fails to return the affidavits, or illegally sells, is fined $200 to $1,000 and imprisoned 90 days to one year, and disqualified to have a permit again for five years. (§ 5.)

All spirituous, malt, vinous, fermented or other intoxicating liquors or mixtures thereof that will produce intoxication are held to be intoxicating liquors. (§ 6.)

It is the duty of all officers to notify the State's Attorney of all violations of this law, with names of witnesses; if they do not they shall be fined $100 to $500 and forfeit office. (§ 8.)

If the State's Attorney is so notified of or is cognizant himself of any such violation, he shall investigate the matter, calling witnesses, and prosecute thereupon; and if the State's Attorney fail therein any Justice may proceed to so collect evidence and lay it before the State's Attorney, who shall then prosecute. (§ 9.)

If it is disclosed that any liquor is kept anywhere for illegal sale, warrant shall issue for search and seizure. (§ 10.)

Fines and forfeitures hereunder go to the liquor prosecution fund. State's Attorneys failing in their duty hereunder shall be fined $100 to $500 and imprisoned 30 to 90 days, and forfeit their offices; and whenever any State's Attorney fails or neglects his said duty, the Attorney-General shall undertake the duty. (§ 12.)

Places where liquors are sold or kept in violation of law are nuisances, and upon establishment of the fact shall be abated. Injunction may be granted at the beginning of the action. Violating such injunction is punished as illegal selling. On such contempt proceedings the defendant may be required to make answer to interrogatories and will not be necessarily discharged upon his denial of the facts stated in the moving papers. (§ 13.)

Full civil damages are given. (§§ 14, 15.)

Members of clubs to use or distribute liquors are punished about the same as those making unlawful sales. (§ 16.)

Giving away liquor and evasions of the law are deemed unlawful selling. (§ 17.)

Fines and costs are liens upon the property upon which the unlawful traffic was conducted, with the knowledge of the owner thereof. (§ 18.)

Any person may employ an attorney to assist the State's Attorney in his duty, and such employed attorney shall be recognized as associate counsel. (§ 20.)

Suspension of judgment for reason as for perfecting appeals may be entered in the handwriting of the Judge. (§ 21.)

Pleading and evidence are simplified and extended in § 22.

The Grand Jury is to be charged with this act specially. (§ 23.)

Druggists may be notified not to sell to habitual drunkards. (§ 24.)

Treating or giving liquor to a minor, except by his father, mother, guardian or physician, is punished as unlawful selling.

Officers or agents of carriers are punished for carrying liquor to be sold contrary to the act, by fine of $100 to $500, with imprisonment 30 to 60 days. (§ 26.)

Persons arrested for violation of this act, giving bond and forfeiting it, upon being surrendered to Sheriff, shall be committed for default of costs not over six months. (§ 27.)

Payments for liquor may be recovered and debts therefor are void. (§ 30.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by a majority vote of the two Houses; to be concurred in by a majority of each House in the next Legislature; upon submission to the people a majority vote of the electors carries it.

Ohio.

Early Provisions.—The sixth law of Ohio Territory punished drunkenness by a fine of five dimes, second offense $1; on default in either case the penalty was an hour in the stocks. (Chase's Statutes, c. 6, § 20 [1788].)

In 1790 the penalty for furnishing liquor to Indians was $5 for every quart; for less than a quart, $4 (half to the informer). (Id., c. 11.) Selling liquor to United States soldiers, without order from an officer, was fined $2. (Id., c. 13.) Selling ardent spirits of any kind without license was fined $5 (half to the informer). Commissioners appointed by the Governor in each county had power to establish public inns and taverns, and also to grant licenses to retailers of spirituous liquors, and they might license such as the Justices in general quarter sessions should recommend as personally qualified, and having premises situated for the accommodation of travellers and citizens; license fee, $16. The Justices, upon complaint and hearing, might annul a license for neglect of duty to provide tavern accommodations or for allowing gaming, unless the licensee gave bond in $100 to obey the law and keep order. Licensees could not collect bills for over $2 for liquors retailed. (Id., c. 24 [1792].)

In 1795 licenses were to be granted by the Governor on the same recommendation and conditions, bond of $300 to be given to keep order and observe the law; and licensees were not to harbor minors or servants, or sell to slaves, upon penalty of $3. (Id., c. 51.)

In 1800 such licenses were to be granted only upon recommendation of 12 freeholders of the county to the Justices of Sessions. The penalty for selling without license was raised to $20. The provision for revocation for disorder was continued, and the license tax was to be $4, $8 or $12, according to advantages of location. (Id., c. 132.)

In 1804 licenses were granted by the Associate Judges of the county, after advertisement 30 days, at prices to be fixed by them. The penalty for not complying with the act was a fine not exceeding $50. The only other prohibition was against disorder and gaming, which was fined not exceeding $20, with forfeiture of license and disqualification one year. (Id., c. 59.)

In 1809 tavern-keepers selling liquor to Indians were fined $5 to $100 and forfeited what they received for it, to be restored to the Indian. (Id., c. 194.) Tavern-keepers permitting sporting, gaming, disorder, revelling or drunkenness were fined not exceeding $20, forfeited their licenses and were disqualified to receive new licenses for a year. The retailing of cider and beer was made free. (Id., c. 196.) License was to be granted by the Court of Common Pleas, and the fine was to be fixed by the County Commissioners. (Id., c. 222.)

In 1818 tavern license was to be granted upon recommendation of 12 landholders of the neighborhood, upon payment of $5 to $30. The penalty for selling without license was a fine not exceeding $20; for allowing disorder and drunkenness, not exceeding $50, with suspension of license four months. Tavern-keepers could not collect bills for liquors retailed in excess of 50 cents. (Id., c. 434.)

By Id., c. 487 (1819), the penalty for selling without license was made not exceeding $100, the other provisions being re-enacted. By Id., c. 565 (1822), neither recommendation nor advertisement was needed to secure a renewal, but both were necessary in applying for a new license. The act of 1823 (Id., c. 631) made no material change in the law which was, however, re-enacted.

In 1830 selling liquor on Sunday was fined $5; selling in other places than licensed houses within one mile of a religious gathering was fined $20. (Id., c. 834, §§ 2–10.) The recommendation of freeholders for license was dispensed with, but advertisement of application was still required, such application being necessary to obtain a renewal as well as a new license; but upon remonstrance of 10 freeholders the licensing Court was to decide. The price of license was $5 to $50; the penalty for selling without license $5 to $100. (Id., c. 857.)

Partial Prohibition of Spirits (1839).—"No tavern license hereafter granted shall be construed to authorize the sale of spirituous liquors in any other than the common bar of the tavern; and any tavern-keeper who shall, either in the basement of the building occupied by him as a tavern, or in any shop or room attached to the same, or in any other place than the barroom attached to the same, or in any other place than the barroom usually occupied as such for the reception of travellers, sell spirituous liquor by less quantity than one quart, or to be drank at the place where sold, shall be subject to the same penalties as though he had no license whatever." (Laws, 1839, p. 54, March 16.)

In 1841, (Laws, p. 53) each and every act conferring power upon any municipal corporation to license groceries or coffee-houses or in any manner to authorize the sale of intoxicating drinks, was repealed.

By Laws of 1844, p. 8, whenever any remonstrance against the granting of any license was made, whether it should contain any statement of facts other than general dissent of the remonstrants or not, and whether any testimony were offered by the remonstrants or not, the Board might grant or refuse license at discretion.

Township Local Option, Constitutional Anti-License, and Prohibition of Sales of Liquor for Consumption on the Premises (1846–54).—Township Local Option was given to 10 counties by Laws of 1846, p. 39. The submission clauses were repealed in 1847. (Laws, p. 33.)

Retailing spirituous liquor to be drunk on the premises was prohibited altogether by Laws of 1850, p. 87, upon penalty of $5 to $25 for the first offense, $5 to $120 for the second, and $5 to $150 for the third. But this act excepted selling for medicinal and pharmaceutical purposes.

Section 18 of the schedule, Constitution of 1851, was submitted and adopted separately. It is: "No license to traffic in intoxicating liquors shall hereafter be granted in this State, but the General Assembly may, by law, provide against evils resulting therefrom."

The act of 1854 (Laws, p. 108) prohibited adulteration of liquors under penalty of $100 to $500 and imprisonment 10 to 30 days. And the laws of that year (p. 153) re-enacted with amplifications the law against selling to be drunk on the premises, adding prohibitions against selling to minors and intoxicated persons. It declared such places nuisances and gave full civil damages. It made it unlawful to become intoxicated. It made the penalty of unlawful selling $20 to $50 and imprisonment 10 to 30 days, and provided somewhat fully for legal procedure. This was the Adair law. The Laws of 1859, p. 173, reduced the penalty for selling to $5 to $50 or imprisonment 10 to 30 days, and excepted from the prohibition domestic wine, beer, ale and cider.

Selling on election day was prohibited, and the duty of enforcing the prohibition devolved on the municipalities, by Laws of 1864, p. 24.

Sales to minors and intoxicated persons were again prohibited under penalty of $10 to $100 or imprisonment 10 to 30 days, or both, by Laws of 1866, p. 149.

The Laws of 1870 (p. 101), elaborated the civil damage sections and made them include the owner of the real estate used for the business.

The Law of 1875, p. 35, made provision for previous notice not to sell to the person in question, in order to obtain civil damages from the seller, but provided very elaborately for such notice.

Smith Sunday Law, Pond Law and Scott Law (1881–3).—The celebrated Smith Sunday law, as originally enacted in 1881 (Laws, p. 126) provided that anyone selling or bartering any liquor on Sunday except upon a physician's prescription should be fined not more than $50. As amended in 1882 (Laws, p. 128) it provided that all liquor places should be closed on Sunday under penalty of $100 fine and imprisonment not exceeding 30 days. It was weakened by the Scott law of 1883, with the proviso that municipal corporations might regulate the sale of beer and native wines on Sunday by ordinance.

The Pond law (Laws, 1882, p. 66) imposed a tax of $100 to $300 on every person engaged in the traffic in intoxicating liquors, and provided that every such person should give bond to comply with the act. It was held in State v. Hipp (38 O. St., 199) that this requirement of a bond was a virtual license, contrary to the article of the Constitution.

This law was re-enacted in the Scott law (Laws, 1883, p. 164) without the obnoxious provision, but providing that the tax was a lien on the premises occupied. This law was held constitutional in State v. Frame (39 O. St., 399), but in Butzman v. Whitbeck (42 O. St., 345) it also was declared to amount to a virtual license provision by reason of the lien imposed.

Submission of Constitutional Amendments (1883).—By Laws of 1883, p. 384, were submitted two propositions to amend the no-license article in the Constitution. One left the Legislature free to pass license laws, the other substituted a regular Prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor to be used as a beverage. It was provided that the submission should be at a general election, and if either proposition received a majority of the votes cast at the election it should be adopted. Neither proposition received such majority.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—The Dow law of 1886 (p. 157; amended by Laws of 1888, p. 116), re-enacted the Scott and Pond laws, with some changes designed to eliminate the unconstitutional provisions above noticed.

Upon the business of trafficking in intoxicating liquors shall be assessed yearly $250. (R. S., 1890, § 8892.) Said assessment shall be a lien on the property upon which the business is conducted and shall be paid at the time of paying other taxes. (Id., § 8893.) When such business is commenced after the fourth Monday of May, said assessment shall be proportionate in amount to the remainder of the year, but it shall not be less than $25; and whenever business is discontinued during the year a proportionate amount of the tax, if not less than $50, shall be refunded. (Id., § 8894.) In case of refusal or neglect to pay this tax the amount shall be levied and made upon the goods and chattels used in the business, and what cannot be thus made shall be added to the tax on the real estate occupied. (Id., § 8895.) If any person refuse to give information of his said business or to sign the Assessor's return of the same, his assessment shall thereupon become $400. (Id., § 8896.) The Auditor shall make duplicates of such assessments and deliver a copy to the County Treasurer (Id., § 8897), who shall collect them and account to the Auditor therefor. (Id., § 8898.)

The phrase "trafficking in intoxicating liquors" means the buying, procuring and selling of such liquors except upon physician's prescription, or for mechanical, pharmaceutical or sacramental purposes, but does not include the manufacture of liquors from the raw material and sale thereof at wholesale at the manufactory. (Id., § 8899.)

Of the revenues and fines resulting under this act, two-tenths shall go to the State, six-tenths to the municipality and two-tenths to the county poor fund. (Id., § 8900.)

The sale of intoxicating liquor on Sunday, except by a druggist upon prescription, is declared unlawful; and all places where liquor is sold, except regular drug-stores, shall be closed on that day upon penalty of $25 to $100 and imprisonment 10 to 30 days. In regular hotels and eating-houses, the word "place" herein used shall mean the room or part of a room where liquors are sold. Any municipal corporation shall have full power to regulate, restrain and prohibit ale, beer and porter-houses or other places where intoxicating liquor is sold. (Id., § 8902.)

Whoever sells liquor to a minor, except upon written order of his parent, guardian or family physician, or to a person intoxicated or in the habit of getting so, shall be fined $25 to $100 and imprisoned from five to 30 days. (Id., § 8903.)

The abrogation or repeal of any section or clause of this law shall not affect any other section or clause thereof. (Id., § 8904.)

In the Dow law as enacted in 1886, after the prohibition to sell on Sunday, it was provided that nothing therein prohibited the Council of any municipal corporation from regulating the sale of beer and native wine on that day as it saw fit.

The Dow law was upheld as constitutional and not tantamount to a license in Adler v. Whitbeck (44 O. St., 539).

Whenever one-fourth of the qualified electors of any township, outside of any municipal corporation, shall petition the Trustees therefor, the Trustees shall order an election to determine whether the sale of liquor as a beverage shall be prohibited therein. A record of the result of such election shall be kept by the Township Clerk in the record of the proceedings of the Township Trustees, and shall be evidence that selling after 30 days from the election is unlawful. (R. S., 1890, § 8906.) Ballots shall be "Against the sale" and "For the sale." Selling after Prohibition is adopted is punished by fine of $50 to $500 and imprisonment not exceeding six months. This does not apply to manufacturers and sellers of cider and domestic wine not in a place where sold as a beverage, or to druggists selling for the excepted purposes. (Id., § 8907.) Another election under the act may be had after two years.

Liquor places shall be closed and no sales made from 12 P. M. to 6 A. M. in Cincinnati, upon penalty of not over $100 and imprisonment 30 days or both. (Id., § 8913.)

Instruction as to the effect of alcoholic drinks and narcotics on the human system is required in public schools, but may be by oral instruction only, and without the use of text-books. (Id., § 8917.) No certificate to teach in the common schools shall be granted to any person who does not pass a satisfactory examination as to the nature of such drinks and narcotics and their effects upon the system. (Id., § 8918.) Any teacher neglecting to give such instruction shall be dismissed. (Id., § 8919.)

All cities and villages have power to regulate ale, beer and porter-houses and shops. (Id., § 1692.)

All incorporated villages having a college or university within their limits may provide by ordinance against the evils resulting from the sale of liquor. (Id., § 1692, *b.*)

The Mayor of any city or village, shall, three days previously to election day, issue a proclamation setting forth the law prohibiting the sale of liquor on that day, and such Mayor shall take proper measures to enforce the same. (Id., § 1838.)

Any person disposing of liquor within one mile of any parade-ground or encampment of the militia may be put under guard by the commandant and turned over to the local officers. (Id., § 3079.)

Any officer shall, upon view or information, apprehend any person selling liquor within two miles of where agricultural fairs are held and seize the booth, stand, or thing at or from which the liquor is being sold, which articles shall be bound for the payment of costs and fines. (Id., §§ 3712–13.)

Inspection of liquor is provided for by Id., §§ 4277, 4327, 4333.

Whoever by the sale of liquor causes intoxication shall pay a reasonable compensation for taking care of such intoxicated person and $1 per day besides. (Id., § 4356.)

Every husband, wife, child, parent, guardian, employer or other person injured in person, property or means of support by intoxication, having given notice, has a right of action for damages sustained, and exemplary damages against those who, by selling the liquor, caused such intoxication. (Id., § 4357.) Any person liable to be injured by the intoxication of any one, and desiring to prevent it, shall give a notice to the sellers, either verbally or in writing, before a witness, or file with the Township or Corporation Clerk notice to all liquor-dealers not to sell liquor to a named person after 10 days. (Id., § 4358.) Such notice so filed shall be entered in a book open to public inspection, and may be erased by the person giving it. (Id., § 4359.) It shall inure to the benefit of all persons interested, the same as if a notice had been served on each. (Id., § 4360.) The unlawful sale of liquor works forfeiture of all rights of a tenant upon premises where it takes place. (Id., § 4361.) Any saloon-keeper who publishes the fact that any such notice has been given him shall be fined $10 to $50. (Id., § 4361.) If a person rent premises for the sale of liquor or permit their use for such purpose, they shall be held liable for all fines, costs or damages assessed against the person occupying the same. (Id., § 4364.)

Whoever is found in a state of intoxication shall be fined $5. (Id., § 6940.)

A keeper of a place where intoxicating liquors are sold in violation of law shall be fined $50 to $100 or imprisoned 10 to 30 days, or both, and the place shall be deemed a common nuisance and be ordered abated. (Id., § 6942.)

Whoever buys liquor for an intoxicated person or habitual drunkard, or a minor unless given by a physician, shall be fined $10 to $100 or imprisoned 10 to 30 days, or both. (Id., § 6943.)

Selling liquor within four miles of any religious assemblage or harvest home festival, or a Grand Army, Sons of Veterans' or Union Veterans' celebration, shall be fined $10 to $100. (Id., § 6945.) Selling liquor within 1,200 yards of Columbus, Dayton, Athens or Toledo Asylums for the Insane, Soldiers' and Sailors' Home, or of the Institution for Feeble-Minded Youth, or the Ohio Soldiers' and Sailors' Orphans' Home, or within two miles of the Boys' Industrial School south of Lancaster, or within two miles of an agricultural fair, or within one mile of any county Children's Home situate within a mile of any village or city in which selling is prohibited by ordinance, shall be fined $25 to $100 or punished by imprisonment not more than 30 days, or both, and the place of sale shall be abated as a nuisance. (Id., § 6946.) Selling within one mile of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Home near Sandusky is so punished. (Id., § 6947.)

Whoever conveys liquor into a jail, or having charge of a jail permits a prisoner to receive liquor except as a medicine, shall be fined $10 to $100 or imprisoned 10 to 30 days. (Id., § 6947.)

No liquor shall be sold and saloons shall be closed election days, upon penalty of a fine of not more than $100 and imprisonment not more than 10 days. (Id., § 6948.)

Adulterating liquor or selling such is punished by fine of $100 to $500 and imprisonment 10 to 30 days. (Id., § 6950.)

Giving liquor to a female to induce illicit intercourse is punished by imprisonment from one to three years. (Id., § 7023 *a.*)

Treating with liquor to influence votes is fined $100 to $2,000 or punished by confinement not more than three years in the Penitentiary. (Id., § 7065.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by vote of three-fifths of the two Houses, at one session; popular vote to be taken at the next general election for Representatives, six months' notice to be given; a majority vote of all the electors voting at such election is necessary to carry it.

Oklahoma Territory.

Lying wholly within Indian Territory, Oklahoma, upon being opened to white settlers in 1889, was subject to the absolute and stringent regulations of the Federal Government, prohibiting the liquor traffic in all its forms within the "Indian country."

In March, 1890, Congress passed an act providing that the general statutes of the State of Nebraska should be in force in Oklahoma until the Legislative Assembly of that Territory should meet and enact laws, except that the Prohibitory regulations relating to the liquor traffic should be retained and be operative during the interval.

Oregon.

Territorial Prohibition (1844).—Oregon's first liquor legislation, under her Territorial Government, was Prohibitory. It was provided that if any person should import or introduce any ardent spirits, with intent to sell the same, he should be fined $50. If any person should sell such liquor, he had to pay a fine of $20. If any person established a manufactory or distillery of the same, he was to be indicted for a nuisance and fined $100, and the apparatus was to be destroyed. Sheriffs, Judges, Constables, Justices of the Peace and other officers were to give notice of any violation of this act to some Justice or Judge, who was to issue warrant for the arrest of the person, who, if guilty, was to be bound over to the next Court. This was not to prevent physicians from selling liquor for medicine, not exceeding a gallon at a time. (Comp. Laws, 1849, p. 94 [passed June 24, 1844, by the Legislative Committee].)

The act of 1845 strengthened the above verbally, provided for search and seizure for illicit manufacture, allowed half of all fines to informers and reduced the quantity physicians might sell to half a pint. (Id., p. 34.)

Selling liquor to Indians had previously, in 1843, been prohibited, under penalty of $100 to $500. (Id., p. 167.)

An act of 1847 proposed that the word "regulate" in the organic law be stricken out, and that where the same occurred in the passage "to pass laws to regulate the introduction, manufacture and sale of ardent spirits," the word "prohibit" be inserted. (Id., p. 44.) This was not adopted. The "organic law" was practically the Constitution of the Territory.

License Act of 1849, *and Subsequent Measures.*—By act of 1849, grocery licenses were to be issued by the Probate Court for not less than $200, upon bonds given in $800 to keep orderly houses and not allow gaming, fines of $50 to $500 being provided for offenses. This license act did not authorize sales of less than a quart, such sales being prohibited under penalty of not exceeding $400. (G. S., 1850, pp. 157–8.)

In 1853 retailing liquor without license was prohibited. The license fee was made $100 per annum. The penalty for selling without license was a fine of $50 to $200. And sales on Sunday were prohibited on penalty of $10 to $25. (Laws, 1853, p. 500.)

In 1874 selling on election day was punished by fine of $25 to $200 or imprisonment 10 to 30 days. (Laws, 1874, p. 72.)

Selling to a minor without consent in writing of a parent or guardian was prohibited under penalty of fine not exceeding $100 or imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both, with forfeiture of license. (Laws, 1876, p. 4.)

In 1885 (Laws, p. 490) a Prohibitory Amendment was proposed and provision for an election thereon made by Laws of 1887, p. 70. The Amendment was defeated.

By Laws of 1885, p. 25, and Special Sess., 1885, p. 38, a license law was passed in form like the first above-named law and almost identical with the existing law given below, except that it applied to cities. That law was declared unconstitutional so far as it applied to cities chartered, and doubt was expressed as to its validity generally on account of irregularities in its passage through the Legislature. (State v. Wright, 14 Or., 365.)

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—No person shall sell intoxicating liquors in less quantity than one gallon without obtaining a license from the County Court. (Laws, 1889, p. 9.) Every person shall pay for such license $400 per year or $200 for malt liquors only, and in the same proportion for a less period. (Id., § 2.) Any person applying for license shall execute a bond to the county in $1,000 to keep an orderly house, permit no gaming, not to open on Sunday, and not to give or sell liquor to minors or habitual drunkards or persons intoxicated; and in case of violating his bond he shall be liable to be fined $50 to $200 and to prosecution as prescribed. (Id., § 3.)

Applicants for license shall obtain the signatures of an actual majority of the whole number of legal voters in the precinct in which they wish to do business, to a petition to grant the license. Such number of names must be equal to a majority of all the votes cast at the last preceding general election, and shall be more than the number signed to any remonstrance against granting the license. (Id., § 4.) The applicant must at his own expense cause the petition, together with notice of the day he will apply for license, to be published four weeks in any daily or weekly paper of the county, or if there is none, he must post in three places in the precinct. (Id., § 5.) On the applicant's producing to the County Court the receipt of the Treasurer for the fee and proof of compliance with the preceding provisions, the County Court may give him a license. (Id., § 6.)

It is the duty of the Prosecuting Attorney, Sheriff, Constable and Justices of the Peace to make complaint of violations of this act, and it is also the duty of the County Clerk to prosecute the bonds given by licensees under this act for violations of the conditions of the same. (Id., § 7.)

Every County Clerk shall on the first day of the term of the Circuit Court deliver to the Grand Jury a list of licensed persons, showing dates of obtainment and expiration of licenses. (Id., § 8.)

If any person sell liquor without license he shall be fined $200 to $400. (Id., § 9.)

It is the duty of the Grand Jury at every term of the Circuit Court to make strict inquiry and return bills of indictment against every person violating this act. (Id., § 10.)

Nothing in this act applies to incorporated towns and cities, and nothing is to be construed to affect the right of owners of vineyards to sell their products in quantities not less than a quart. (Id., § 11.) Selling or giving liquor to minors, or permitting them to loiter about a place where liquor is sold, is punished by fine of $50 to $300 or imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both, and forfeiture of license. (Code, 1887, § 1913.) Selling to persons intoxicated or in the habit of becoming so forfeits $100. (Id., § 1914.) Disposing of liquor within half a mile of fair grounds is fined $10 to $100. (Id., § 1915.) On repetition of the offense double that penalty is charged. (Id., § 1916.) These two sections do not apply to persons regularly licensed in the business, and the prohibition extends only for two days prior and subsequent to the holding of the fair. (Id., § 1917.)

No prison officer shall give or suffer to be delivered to any prisoner any liquor without a physician's certificate, on pain of forfeiting $25. (Id., § 3972.) Other persons so delivering are fined $15. (Id., § 3973.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by majority vote of the two Houses; to be concurred in by a majority of each House in the next Legislature; a majority vote of the electors carries it.

Pennsylvania.

Colonial Provisions.—Under the Dutch administration a small excise was laid on liquors imported, and the sale of liquor to Indians was forbidden in 1655. (Laws, 1676 to 1700; Harrisburg, 1873, p. 431.) The Duke of York's "Book of Laws" (for which see *New York*) was in force in Pennsylvania from 1664 to 1682; in 1682 the "Great Law, or Body of Laws," was enacted at Chester.

Drunkenness was fined 5*s*; second offense, 10*s*. (Id., p. 111, c. 12.) Those permitting it at their houses were fined the same. (Id., c. 13.) Drinking healths was fined the same. (Id., c. 14.) Selling to Indians was fined £5. (Id., c. 15.) So was keeping an ordinary without license from the Governor. (Id., p. 138, c. 97.) Ordinaries might be suppressed by the county sessions for disorder. (Id., p. 172, c. 169.)

In 1710 licensees had to be recommended by the Lieutenant-Governor, upon recommendation of County Courts, upon payment of £3 40*s* and 30*s*. Selling without license was fined £5, and suffering disorder, drunkenness or gaming was fined 40*s*, with suppression of license for the second offense. (Bradford's Laws, p. 95.)

Local Option in the Vicinity of Furnaces (1725).—In 1725 licenses could be procured in the vicinity of a furnace only by permit of a majority of the owners of the furnace. (Id., p. 325.)

Distillation of Grain Prohibited (1778).—In 1778 distillation from grain was prohibited for a limited time. (McKean's Laws, p. 160.)

Early State Provisions.—In 1783 the rates of tavern licenses were doubled. (Laws, 1783, c. 61.)

By Laws of 1786, c. 297, the Justices of Quarter Sessions were to meet and decide how many licenses they would have, and then only recommend that number to the Executive Council for license. (Laws, 1786, c. 297.)

A general licensing act, in 1834, gave the licensing authority to Courts of Quarter Sessions, which Courts were not to grant any, however, that were not necessary to travellers (and then only to fit persons); license fee, $10 per $100 of the annual rental value of the place. Keeping a tavern without license was fined $10 to $100, and selling without license was fined not exceeding $100. Licenses might be revoked for disorder, allowing gaming or harboring minors. (Laws, 1833, No. 69.)

Act No. 63 of Laws of 1841 provided that notice should be published of all applications for tavern licenses, and made the price of license $10 for a house whose yearly rental did not exceed $100, $15 for one not exceeding $200, and in all other cases $15 and 4 per cent. additional on the rental above $100. Inns and taverns were to be construed to be only houses where liquor was retailed. Persons convicted of retailing without license were fined $20 to $100.

By an act of the same year (No. 117), to provide revenue, a tax on all vendors of goods, wares and merchandise of from $12.50 to $200, according to the amount of sales, was imposed, providing that those who sold liquor, with or without other goods, should pay 50 per cent. more.

By resolution No. 10, p. 442 of Laws of 1841, the Clerk of Quarter Sessions of Philadelphia County was to publish lists of names of persons licensed at all times when any licenses were granted. This requirement for publication of applications for license was repealed as to 24 counties in 1842. (Laws, pp. 216, 377, 459.)

Tavern licenses were not to be granted to Sheriffs. (Laws, 1842, p. 201.)

Local Prohibition (1843)—Licenses for sales of liquor were prohibited within four and three miles, respectively, of iron works and furnaces in Armstrong and Clarion Counties, and the license law was made more stringent for Chester County by Laws of 1843, p. 383.

The question of license or no-license was submitted to the voters in Clearfield County by Laws, 1845, No. 223. The same question was submitted to the people in 18 counties and two boroughs, by Laws of 1846, No. 206, and in another county by No. 359. Such Local Option was declared a delegation of legislative power, and unconstitutional, by Parker v. Com., 6 Pa. St., 507; but this decision was reversed by Locke's Appeal, 72 Pa. St., 492.

By Laws of 1846, No. 359, § 4, on every application for license the Court was required to give remonstrances such consideration as the facts set forth therein were entitled to.

Houses where beer, ale and other malt liquors were kept, were required to obtain licenses of the County Treasurer and pay $5 to $200 per year, according to amount of sales. (Laws, 1849, No. 369, §§20–23.) Distillers and brewers were also taxed $5 to $100, according to business (§ 32). The changes in these revenue taxes were frequent at and before this time. Many laws were passed (some at every session), modifying the license laws in different localities. A complete body of laws was thus formed for Philadelphia and Allegheny Counties separately, differing little essentially from each other or from the law of the State at large. But the prevailing tendency was not, as in the South, toward Prohibition.

Furnishing drinks wilfully to minors, intoxicated persons and those habitually becoming so, was punished by fine of $10 to $50, with imprisonment 10 to 60 days. Notice to dealers might be given by any relative of any habitual drunkard, not to sell to him, and upon disregarding such notice the offender was punished as above. Civil damages for injuries to person and property on account of unlawful selling were provided. Adulteration was prohibited, and the sale of such liquor, upon penalty of $50, and for second offense $100 and imprisonment not exceeding 60 days. Action for the value of liquors unlawfully sold was refused, and prosecutors under this act were allowed not exceeding $20, to be taxed as costs in the case. (Laws, 1854, No. 648.)

Liquor-selling on Sunday was prohibited upon pain of forfeiting $50 (half to the prosecutor). (Laws, 1855, No. 55.) Another act of 1855 (No. 239) made the license fee three times the amount then required, and in no case less than $30. It also refused to allow license to be issued to any hotel, restaurant or place of amusement or refreshment-keeper, and abrogated City and County Treasurers' licenses. This act, in certain provisions, reads like a Prohibitory law, and in some of the lists of early Prohibitory statutes it is included; but it was really a license law. The policy indicated in the last above-named law was abandoned the next year by Laws of 1856, No. 233, which was a full license act, and remained the basis of the law until the High License law of 1887 was passed. It provided a license fee of twice the amount required before the adoption of the act of 1855, not to be less than $50 for beer, wine and spirituous liquor-vendors; $25 to $1,000 according to rental value of property for taverns, except that in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh the minimum was $75. Brewers and distillers were taxed as before, but not less than $50 for any one. The Licensing Court was given power to grant licenses after hearing by evidence, petition, remonstrance or counsel. Tavern and eating-house licenses were to be granted only when required for the convenience of the public. Eating-houses could be licensed only to sell malt liquor and domestic wines. The number of licenses for taverns could not exceed one for every 100 ratables in the cities and 150 in the counties. The number of eating-house licenses could not exceed one-fourth that number. The penalty for violating the act was a fine of $10 to $100, and for a second offense imprisonment one to three months in addition to such fine. The license fees were reduced about half by the act of 1858 (Laws, No. 405), and the denial of licenses to theatres was changed to give them and beer-houses and other places of amusement licenses to sell domestic wines and malt liquors. The Courts, upon hearing, were empowered to refuse licenses if not necessary for the accommodation of the public, except in Philadelphia. (Laws, 1859, No. 652.)

An act to prevent recovery of the price of adulterated liquors sold, was passed in 1860. (No. 345.) Hawking and peddling liquors in Potter County were prohibited by No. 431 and No. 585 of the laws of the same year. Constables in Philadelphia were to make returns of all persons vending liquors, and those without license were to be fined not exceeding $200 and imprisoned not more than two years.

By the act of 1862 (No. 484), the Mercantile Appraisers were to personally visit each liquor-store and give notice to the owner of his assessment and its amount.

The use of deleterious drugs in the manufacture of liquor, and the sale of the same, was made a misdemeanor and fined not exceeding $500, with imprisonment not exceeding 12 months, or both, by Laws of 1863, No. 384.

To enable police officers to enforce order and exterminate the unlicensed traffic, selling to minors and apprentices without leave of parent or guardian, to husband or child, against the request of wife or parent, or keeping open and selling between midnight and sunrise were prohibited upon penalty of forfeiture of license. Police officers were to enforce these prohibitions and keep order in saloons upon request, and every person arrested for being drunk was to be interrogated as to where he got his liquor. And persons selling contrary to this act were made liable for damages growing out of such sales. (Laws, 1867, No. 70.) This act was repealed by Laws of 1868, No. 33.

Local Option Law of 1872–5.—In 1872 there were several local liquor laws passed. Such laws (many of them being of insignificant character) had considerably multiplied. By Laws of 1872, No. 41, the question of granting licenses to sell liquor was to be submitted at all the annual municipal elections in every city and county, not oftener than once a year for the same place. The act of 1873, No. 16, amplified this act and made it more certain.

The Laws of 1875, No. 47, repealed the Local Option law and re-enacted the license provisions, with license fee at $50 up, according to estimated amount of sales; penalty for unlicensed selling, $200 to $500, on second conviction $500 to $1,000 and imprisonment three months to one year. Notices not to sell to excessive drinkers were provided for, with civil damages in case of violating the notice. Sales on election days, Sundays, to minors and to those visibly intoxicated, were prohibited without specific penalty being provided.

Submission of Constitutional Prohibition (1889).—An Amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor to be used as a beverage was submitted (Laws, 1889, p. 439) and defeated.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—The law whose features are here given is the Brooks law of 1887, which is complete in itself. It probably does not displace every provision of the former statutes, but so little is left as to be of no use for the purposes for which such statutes are made.

It is unlawful to keep any place where any vinous, spirituous, malt or brewed liquors are sold at retail without license. (Purd. Dig., Supp., 1887, p. 2229, § 1.) Licenses to retail such liquors in quantities not exceeding one quart shall be granted only to citizens of the United States, of temperate habits and good moral character. (Id., § 2.) Such licenses shall be granted only by the Courts of Quarter Sessions, and shall be for one year from a date fixed by rule or standing order of the Court. (Id., § 3.) The Court shall fix by standing order the time at which applications for licenses will be heard, at which time all persons applying or making objections to applications for licenses may be heard by evidence, petition, remonstrance or counsel. (Id., § 4.) Applicants for licenses shall file their petitions three weeks before the first day of the session at which they are to be heard and shall pay $5 for expenses. The Clerk shall cause publication three times in two designated newspapers of list of the names of all applicants, their residences and the places for which applications are made. (Id., § 5.)

No license shall be granted to sell in any room where groceries are sold. (Id., § 6.) In cities of the first class, in the month of January, the Mercantile Appraiser must return with the list of mercantile taxes all licensed and unlicensed hotels, restaurants or saloons selling liquor. (Id., § 7.) The petition for license shall contain the name and residence of the applicant and state how long he has lived there, shall indicate the particular place for which license is desired, shall state the place of birth of applicant and if naturalized when, shall give the name of the owner of the premises, shall state that the place is necessary to the accommodation of the public and that the applicant is not interested in any other place for which license is to be asked, nor will be during the existence of the license, shall state whether the applicant has had a license revoked within a year, and shall give the names of two freeholders of the ward or township, who will go sureties on the bond required, each person to be worth $2,000 and not to be engaged in the manufacture of liquor. (Id.) His petition must be verified by affidavit. (Id., § 8.) There shall be annexed to such petition a certificate signed by 12 reputable electors of the ward, borough or township, that they know the applicant and have reason to believe the statements of the petition are true, and praying that the license issue. (Id., § 9.)

The Court of Quarter Sessions shall hear petitions from residents of the ward, borough or township in favor of or remonstrating against the application, and in all cases shall refuse the same whenever, in the opinion of the Court (having due regard to the number and character of the petitioners for and against the application), such license is not necessary for the accommodation of the public and entertainment of strangers or travellers, or the applicant is not a fit person. (Id., § 10.) Upon sufficient cause shown or proof made to the said Licensing Court that any licensee has violated any law relating to the sale of liquor, the Court shall upon notice to him revoke his license. (Id., § 11.)

Persons licensed in cities of the first, second and third classes shall pay $500 annually; those in other cities, $300;[1] those in boroughs, $150; in townships, $75. In cities of the first class four-fifths shall go to the city and county and one-fifth to the State; in cities of the second and third classes, two-fifths shall go to city and county respectively and one-fifth to the State; in other cities and boroughs three-fifths shall go to city or borough, one-fifth to the county and one-fifth to the State; in townships one-half shall be paid to the township, one-fourth to the county and one-fourth to the State. Municipalities receiving parts of said license moneys shall bear their proportionate share of the cost of collection. (Id., § 12.) If persons neglect to pay the license fee within 15 days, no license shall issue to them, but be revoked. (Id., § 13.) The license shall not issue until the licensee executes a bond in $2,000 to observe the liquor laws, and pay all costs, fines and penalties which may be imposed upon him. (Id., § 14.) The constables of the respective wards, boroughs or townships in each county shall in the first week of Quarter Sessions make returns of all places where liquor is sold, stating which are licensed and which not, and on failure shall be fined not exceeding $500 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both. (Id., § 15.) Every constable must visit, at least once a month, all places within his jurisdiction where liquor is sold, to ascertain whether there are violations of law, and shall make returns to the Court of Quarter Sessions, with the names of the witnesses thereto. (Id., § 16.)

Each licensee shall frame his license and hang it conspicuously in his place of business. (Id., § 17.) No licensee shall give credit for liquor retailed, on penalty of losing the debt. (Id., § 18.) Any person on conviction of selling without license shall pay $500 to $5,000 and be imprisoned three to 12 months. (Id., § 19.) Licensees violating the license law shall be fined $100 to $500; for second conviction, $300 to $1,000, and for third, $500 to $5,000 or suffer imprisonment three to 12 months, or both. (Id., § 20.) Any person convicted of more than one offense shall not again be licensed in the State. (Id., § 21.) The license of any person permitting the customary visitation of disreputable persons or keeping a disorderly house, shall be revoked, and the licensee shall not again be licensed in the State. (Id., § 22.)

Druggists are not required to be licensed, but they shall not sell liquor except upon physicians' prescriptions; alcohol, however, or any preparations containing the same, may be sold for scientific, mechanical or medicinal purposes. Only one sale can be made on one prescription. Any person wilfully prescribing liquor as a beverage to persons of intemperate habits shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. (Id., § 23.)

---

[1] By a decision of the State Supreme Court it was found that an act of the Legislature providing for the classification of cities was defective in some respects, and accordingly the license rate becomes $500 uniformly in all cities, pending the adoption of new legislation.

No person with or without license may furnish liquor on any election day, or on Sunday, or to any minor or person of known intemperate habits, or to a person visibly intoxicated, for his own use or that of another, or furnish liquor on a pass-book or store-order, or in exchange for goods, wares, merchandise or provisions, upon penalty of $50 to $500 and imprisonment 20 to 90 days. (Id., § 24.)

Any house, room or place where liquors are sold in violation of law, is declared a nuisance, and shall be abated by proceedings in law or equity. (Id., § 25.)

All local laws fixing a license fee less than is here required are repealed. None of the provisions of this law shall authorize sales in places having special Prohibitory laws. (Id., § 27.)

Any wholesale dealer, brewer, distiller, refiner or compounder dealing in liquor, shall pay an annual license in cities of the first three classes of $500; in other cities, $300; in boroughs, $200, and in townships, $100, which shall go to the State Treasury. (Id., § 28.) Licenses to such persons shall be granted by the Court of Quarter Sessions as for other licenses.[1] Such wholesalers, etc., shall not sell in less quantities than one gallon. (Id., § 29.) Bottlers shall also procure licenses as above, for which they shall pay $200 in cities of the first three classes, and $100 elsewhere, but they may not sell to be drunk on the premises. (Id., § 29.)

There is a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. (Laws, 1885, No. 6.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by a majority vote of the two Houses, to be concurred in by a majority of each House in the next Legislature; a majority vote of the electors carries it.

Rhode Island.

Colonial Provisions.—In 1647 taverns, ale-houses and victualling-houses were not to be kept without license, under penalty of 20*s*. (1 R. I. Col. Rec., 185.) Each town might allow such houses, and bind the keepers by bond to keep good order, and not allow unlawful games, nor suffer any townsman to remain tippling there for an hour, under penalty of 10*s*, the townsman forfeiting 3*s* 4*d*. (Id.) Drunkenness was forbidden upon penalty of 5*s*, or six hours in the stocks on default; for a second offense, 10*s* and recognizance in £10 for good behavior. (Id., p. 186.) Selling to Indians was forbidden under penalty of £5 (half to the informer). (Id., p. 279.) Each town was ordered to license one or two houses for entertainment of strangers, and to encourage them. No one else was to be licensed to sell liquor. (Id., p. 280.)

In 1656 the constables and ordinary-keepers, with warrant, might search any man's house to see what quantity of liquor he had. (Id., p. 331.)

In 1673 no liquor was to be sold Sunday on pain of 6*s*. (Id., p. 503.)

In 1721, upon complaint, Town Councils might post prohibitions against selling liquor to persons named as drunkards; penalty, 20*s*; for second offense, 40*s*. (Laws of 1730, p. 114 [passed 1721].)

By the Laws of 1767, p. 169, the license-fee was put at not exceeding £5.

Early State Provisions.—By the Laws of 1798, p. 391, Town Councils might grant license, at discretion, for $20, and unlicensed selling was fined $20.

In 1822 the license was $4 to $20, and the penalty for selling without was $50. (P. L., 1822, p. 295.)

License was increased to $5 to $50 by Laws of 1830, p. 726.

By Laws of 1834, p. 837, the Town Councils might prohibit sales on Sunday and such other days as they thought proper.

License was placed at $10 to $25 to those having tavern accommodations only, by Laws of 1837, p. 930. In 1838 (Laws, p. 1021) licenses to tavern-keepers as above were placed at $10 to $50, with retail license (not to be drunk on the premises) at not exceeding $20.

Local Option by Towns and Wards (1838).—The Laws of 1838 (p. 1033) also provided that towns and wards might by vote instruct that no licenses be granted therein.

The last two laws were consolidated and enacted, with several other prohibitions and provisions for enforcement, by Laws of 1839, p. 1073.

A new law in 1841 left out the Local Option provision (Laws, p. 2038.)

The Town Councils had power to regulate retailing by granting or refusing licenses. Licenses were placed at $12 to $50; selling without license was fined $50. Licensees were to maintain good order, and were not to sell on Sunday, or to any habitual drunkard or person intoxicated, or suffer their places to be frequented by such, or one who was wasting his property or earnings, or by minors, or to suffer games for liquor, upon penalty of $50. Licensees were to give bonds in $200 to obey the law, and the Town Councils might annul a license for conviction of disorder, and the culprit would be disqualified to secure another for two years. (P. L., 1844, p. 495.)

The Local Option provision was re-enacted in 1845. (Laws, p. 620.)

In no-license towns one or more persons might be licensed to sell for medicinal and art purposes. (Laws, 1848, p. 728.)

Penalties were reduced to $20 by Laws of 1848, p. 735.

Maine Law of 1852–63.—A law prohibiting the manufacture and sale, or Maine law, was enacted in 1852. (Laws, p. 3.) It provided for Town Agents, and punished selling in violation of the law by $20 fine. In 1853 a similar act, but having a penalty of $20 and 10 days' imprisonment for the first offense, was enacted; and the question of its repeal was submitted to vote of the people (Laws, 1853, p. 232), and not concurred in.

The act was very much changed and extended by Laws of 1856, p. 48.

---

[1] By a decision of the State Supreme Court, made in 1889, the power of the Courts of Quarter Sessions to refuse applications for wholesale and brewers' licenses was practically nullified.

License Again (1863–74).—A license law was substituted for the Prohibitory one in 1863. (Laws, c. 444.) License was placed at $100, or $30 if liquor were sold only in less quantities than three gallons. The only formality necessary to get a license was to file in the Town Clerk's office a notice of intention to sell liquors, pay the fee, and give bond to the Town Council in $200 to keep good order, and not sell Sunday, to minors, drunkards or those drunk. The penalty for selling without license was $20.

The Town Councils were given power to limit the number of licenses granted, at discretion. (Laws, 1865, c. 553.)

Town Councils, at absolute discretion, were to grant licenses, and charge therefor $200 to $500, and they might revoke them upon violations of law. (Laws, 1867, c. 670.)

Special constables to enforce the law were authorized to be appointed by Town Councils (Laws, 1868, c. 757), and Sheriffs might appoint deputies for the same purpose. (Laws, 1869, c. 823.)

No licenses were to be granted after a town voted not to grant them. (Laws, 1872, c. 990.)

An elaborate inspection-of-liquors act was passed in 1877. (Laws, c. 973.)

Prohibition, License, and Adoption and Repeal of Constitutional Prohibition (1874–89).—In 1874 (Laws, c. 385), the shortest Prohibitory law on record was passed. It repealed the license clauses, and the words "licensed" and "unlicensed." Sales for medicinal, art and mechanical purposes were not interfered with.

A very extended license law, including Town Local Option, was passed in 1875. (Laws, c. 508.) It charged $150 to $300 for a license to retail, required bond in $1,000 and punished unlawful sales by $20 fine and imprisonment 10 days for first conviction. Cider and domestic wines were excepted from the law. This law was many times amended, and another general act was passed in 1881 (Laws, c. 889), of the same general character but with more extended prohibitions and provisions for enforcement.

By Laws of 1886, c. 550, a Prohibitory Amendment against "the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors to be used as a beverage," was submitted to the people and passed. The Laws of that year (c. 596) established a Prohibitory law. It provided for a State Police. There were search and seizure clauses but no injunction clauses. Special prohibitions of sales to minors and habitual drunkards, after notice, were incorporated. Penalties: for manufacturing and selling, $20 and 10 days for the first offense, $50 and three months for the second, and $100 and three to six months for the third; for common selling and manufacturing, $100 and 60 days for the first offense and $200 and four months for subsequent ones.

The Prohibitory Amendment (art. 5 of the Amendments to the Constitution) was submitted for annullment by Laws of 1889, May session, c. 808, and being carried, the Prohibitory law was repealed.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—No person shall manufacture or sell, or keep or suffer the same, any intoxicating liquor, except as provided. Intoxicating liquor includes ale, wine, rum or other strong or malt liquors, or mixed liquors, any part of which is said liquors, or any mixture of liquors which contains more than 2 per cent. by weight of alcohol. (Laws, Special Session, 1889, c. 816, § 1.) The Town Councils and the Boards of Commissioners hereinafter provided may grant or refuse licenses in their towns or cities as they shall think proper. Such licenses shall expire May 1, and shall cost a price in proportion to the price for a year, if for less than that period. They shall not authorize sales on Sunday, to any woman (except as hereinafter provided), to any minor, or person of notoriously intemperate habits, or to any person on a pass-book or order on a store, or the exchange of goods, wares or merchandise for liquors.

Before granting license the application shall be advertised two weeks in some newspaper of the town, or if there is none, some newspaper of the county, giving notice of the name of the applicant and the particular location of the place; and there shall be opportunity for remonstrants to be heard. No license shall be granted when the owners or occupants of the greater part of the land within 200 feet of the proposed place file their objection thereto. Bond in the sum of $2,000 shall be first given and the license fee paid, three-fourths thereof being for the use of the town or city, and one-fourth for the general Treasury of the State. (Id., § 2.) The Mayors of the several cities shall appoint three Commissioners, to hold office until April, 1890, and then three to hold one, two and three years respectively; and Town Councils may elect three such Commissioners in April of each year, to be compensated as City and Town Councils respectively shall provide, not exceeding $5 per day of actual employment in the latter case. Such Commissioners shall elect one of their number Clerk, who shall keep records which shall be evidence when certified by said Clerk. The Commissioners shall annually, on or before Feb. 1, make report of the licenses granted by them. Members of the Town Councils are ineligible to be such Commissioners. (Id., § 3.)

The electors of the cities and towns shall at each election of general officers vote for or against granting licenses, but no such vote shall be taken unless electors equivalent in number to 10 per cent. of the whole vote cast at the last such election in cities, and 15 per cent. in towns, petition the City or Town Clerk therefor 20 days prior to the election, when the proposition shall be put in the warrant for the election. If the vote be for no-license it shall stand until another such vote be called. (Id., § 4.)

No license shall be issued for any place, except a licensed tavern, where a dwelling-house or place used as such is connected from within such licensed place. And no entrance shall be allowed other than directly from a public-travelled way, except in taverns, on penalty of forfeiting the license. (Id., § 5.)

Fees for license shall be: To manufacture or sell at wholesale or retail (not to be drunk on the premises), $500 to $1,000; to sell at retail only, $400 for Providence, $350 for other places of over 15,000 inhabitants, $300 for places down to 6,000 people, and $200 to $300 for all other towns. A license to manufacture carries with it the right to sell at wholesale at the manufactory. Sales in less quantities than two gallons are retail sales; in larger quantities, wholesale. (Id., § 6.)

No licensee shall sell liquors to any unlicensed dealer, or to any keeper of any house of ill-fame, having reason to believe the same are to be resold, on penalty of $100 and 30 days' imprisonment and disqualification to hold license for four years. (Id., § 7.)

Importers of liquors under United States law may own or sell such liquors in original packages in quantities not less than such law requires for importation, and such liquor shall be as pure and unadulterated as when imported. (Id., § 8.)

The Commissioners may permit a license to be transferred on notice (given as for a new license), and on consent of sureties or a new bond. In case of death of any licensee the license is part of the personal estate of the deceased. (Id., § 9.) All licenses shall state the name of the person and place licensed, the class and the amount paid. They shall be signed as the Commissioners direct and be posted conspicuously in the room of the sale and be exhibited to all officers on demand. (Id., § 10.)

If any licensee is convicted of a violation of this law, the Town or City Treasurer must put his bond in suit and recover the penal sum thereof. If a licensee permit his place to become disorderly to the disturbance of the neighborhood, or shall permit gaming or the violation of any laws of the State therein, he may be summoned before the Commissioners and witnesses may be heard and his license be revoked, and he disqualified for license for five years. (Id., § 11.)

Every person selling liquor to be sold to any woman (to be drunk on the premises), or to any minor, shall be fined $100 and imprisoned 90 days to one year, and be disqualified for license for five years. (Id., § 12.)

Every person who shall forcibly eject from his premises any intoxicated person to whom he has sold liquor, shall be fined $20 and be disqualified one year. (Id., § 13.)

The Town Councils shall appoint special constables to enforce the liquor laws. (Id., § 14.) They shall have the powers of the State Police and Chiefs of Police of cities. (Id., § 15.) The Sheriffs, their deputies, the town Sergeants and Constables, and the Chiefs of Police of cities, shall constitute a State Police; and it shall be their duty to see that the laws are enforced and their special duty to prevent and repress crime by the suppression of all unlicensed liquor-shops, etc., and they shall do so upon the request of any tax-payer of the town or city. Any member of such police neglecting or refusing to perform such duties, shall be fined not exceeding $500 and be rendered ineligible to be again appointed to any such position. (Id., § 16.) The Sheriff shall appoint or designate one deputy to discharge the duty under this law. (Id., § 18.)

Any person selling or offering for sale, by sample or otherwise, liquors in violation of this chapter, shall be sentenced to pay a fine of $20 and to be imprisoned 10 days, and for the second conviction $50 and three months; third, $100 and three to six months. (Id., § 19.) The penalty for unlawfully keeping liquor for sale is $20 and 10 days in jail. (Id., § 20.) Section 821 gives forms to be used in prosecutions under the last two sections.

No negative allegations of any kind need be averred or proved in any complaint hereunder, and evidence of the sale or keeping for sale of any liquor enumerated herein shall be evidence of unlawful sale or keeping, but the respondent may show his license or authority by way of defense. (Id., § 22.)

No sales shall be made on Sunday except by pharmacists upon physicians' prescriptions, and Town Councils or City Boards of Aldermen may prohibit sales during specific hours, on election days or holidays, giving public notice thereof for 24 hours. Any person selling on Sunday or during such prohibited hours shall be fined $20 and imprisoned 10 days for first conviction, $50 and three months for second, and shall forfeit license and be disqualified for five years. (Id., § 24.)

Common carriers receiving liquor which has been sold or is intended to be sold in violation of law, having reasonable cause to believe the same, shall be fined $20 and may be prosecuted in the town where received or any town into which it has been carried. (Id., § 26.) Persons having authority from railroads so receiving such liquors shall be fined $20. (Id., § 27.)

If any person shall make complaint under oath before any Justice or Clerk of a District Court that liquors are kept in any place for unlawful sale, such Justice or Clerk shall issue a search-warrant therefor. (Id., § 28.) Such warrant shall describe the place and liquors as nearly as may be and state the name of the owner, if known; and such liquor shall be seized and held by the officer, who shall summon the owner, if to be found by him. (Id., § 29.) If such place be a dwelling-house, the complaint must state a belief that liquors have been sold unlawfully therein within 30 days, and are then kept therefor therein, and state the facts upon which that belief is founded. (Id., § 30.) If the owner be not found, notice of such seizure shall be posted in three places, and such other notice as the Court deems necessary. (Id., § 31.) Liquors so seized, if so kept, shall be forfeited, and an officer shall be designated by the Court to prosecute for the forfeiture thereof. (Id., § 32.) If the cause of forfeiture be not proved, the liquor shall be returned. (Id., § 33.) If proved the Court shall issue warrant for destruction of such liquor. (Id., § 34.) Any irregularity in notice for seizure or forfeiture may be permitted to be amended, and further notice, to secure personal notice to the owner, may be directed. (Id., § 35.) The officer shall be allowed $5 for service and $2 for days additionally employed thereabout, and 10 cents per mile travelled, and a reasonable sum for storage and care, all of which shall be taxed as costs and paid by the State Auditor. (Id., § 36.)

Fines recovered under §§ 19 and 20 shall be half to the complainant, and judgment rendered upon a subsequent complaint for the same offense shall be no bar to any prior complaint; but the pendency of the former complaint may be pleaded in bar of the second. (Id., § 37.)

Any person convicted under this chapter in the District Court, may appeal within five days to the next Court of Common Pleas. (Id., § 38.) On appeal the appellant must give bond in $100 for his appearance, and that he will not during the pendency of the appeal violate this chapter. (Id., § 39.) Upon neglecting to give such bond the appellant shall be committed. (Id., § 40.) On such appeal any witness sworn may be required to give bond in $50 to testify on the appeal. (Id., § 41.)

Every person manufacturing unlawfully, or who shall become a common seller, shall be punished by fine of $100 and 90 days' imprisonment for the first conviction, and $200 and six months for second and subsequent ones. Several sales to the same or different persons constitute one a common seller, and being twice convicted under § 19, and convicted of another violation thereof within six months succeeding the last, sustains an allegation of being a common seller. (Id., § 43.)

Nothing herein shall prohibit the manufacture or sale of cider, or the manufacture of wine or malt liquor for domestic use, or the manufacture of alcohol for exportation out of the State. (Id., § 44.) Nor shall anything herein apply to the domestic manufacture of wine from currants, grapes or other fruits or berries grown in the State, or to the sale thereof in quantities not less than a gallon. (Id., § 45.)

No officer complaining of a violation of this chapter shall be required to become liable for costs. (Id., § 46.)

If any person in a state of intoxication from liquor furnished him in violation of law, injure any person, the seller of the liquor is liable therefor, jointly with the person intoxicated, or separately. (Id., § 47.)

Selling to women (to be drunk on the premises), or to a minor, or allowing either to loiter upon the premises, forfeits $100, to be recovered by the husband of the woman or parent or guardian of the minor. (Id., § 48.) The husband, wife, parent, child, guardian or employer of any habitual drunkard may give notice requesting no sales to such person, and if sales be made to such person or he be allowed to loiter upon the premises, the person notified is liable to the giver of the notice in damages. (Id., § 49.)

The Mayor and Aldermen of any city, or the Town Council or any member thereof, or the Chief of Police or any police officer, or any constable specially authorized, or any of the State Police may enter upon the premises of a licensed person to ascertain his method of doing business or to preserve order, and may arrest without warrant anyone therein violating the law and keep him in custody not over 24 hours, till he can be brought before a magistrate. Whenever any person is seen to drink on any such premises on Sunday, or prohibited days or hours, it shall be evidence that the liquors were sold by the occupant. (Id., § 50.)

On a conviction carrying revocation of license, the Clerk of the Court shall give notice to the Board of Commissioners, on penalty of $50. (Id., § 51.)

Pharmacists may sell liquor not exceeding one pint for medical purposes, once only, upon a physician's prescription, which shall be filed. Persons making false statements to so procure liquor shall be fined $50 to $100. The sale of pure alcohol for mechanical or art purposes is not prohibited. (Id., § 52.)

In any complaint or warrant it shall not be necessary to set forth the kind or quantity of liquor sold or the time of sale or manufacture; but proof of any violation set forth in substance is sufficient. The record of previous convictions shall be set forth, with the date thereof. (Id., § 53.)

Defects of form in any action may be amended. (Id., § 54.)

In all appeals the Attorney-General shall conduct the case for the State. (Id., § 55.)

Payments for liquor sold unlawfully shall be held without consideration (Id., § 56), and no action shall be maintained for the value of liquor drunk on the premises or unlawfully sold. (Id., § 57.)

Obstructions preventing a clear view of the interior of licensed premises by the passer-by shall be removed all day Sunday, on penalty of $20. (Id., § 58.)

The Treasurer of a town or city shall, on June and Dec. 10, make returns to the State Treasurer of all moneys for licenses belonging to the State. (Id., § 60.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by majority vote of the two Houses; to be concurred in by a majority of each House in the next Legislature; an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the electors voting on the question is necessary to adoption.

South Carolina.

Colonial Provisions.—There was an act passed in 1683 to prevent unlicensed taverns and punch-houses, and for ascertaining the rates and prices of wine and other liquors. It is not now to be found.

The act of 1686 (2 Stats. at Large, 18) provided that no one should retail liquor without obtaining license of the Governor, upon penalty of £10. Those selling under one gallon were retailers. The license fee to retail wine was £5, to retail punch £3. This act did not extend to any inhabitants of the country who sold rum or other liquors to their servants or workmen, or who supplied their neighbors out of their houses. This was to provide revenue to support the Governor.

The act of 1694 (Id., 85) for regulating public houses commenced with these words: "WHEREAS, The unlimited number of taverns, tap-houses and punch-houses, and the want of sobriety, honesty and discretion in the owners and masters of such houses have and will encourage all such vices as are the productions of drunkenness." This act substantially repeated former laws.

The act of 1695 (Id., 113) adopted and enacted the statutes and common law of England for the government of public houses. Peddling liquor was prohibited in 1703. (Id., 199.)

Sales by planters excepted by former acts were by act of 1709 (Id., 337) limited to sales not to be drunk on the premises. Up to this time these laws were re-enacted for the term of each Governor, but in 1711 (Id., 363) the act was made permanent.

Early State Provisions.—By the act of 1783 (4 Id., 565) licenses were put at 50*s*, and in Charleston at £5 more, and the penalty of selling without license was put at £50. By another act of the same year (Id., 576), such licenses were placed at £10 and £3 respectively. By the first of these acts an import duty of 4*d* was levied on every gallon of liquor imported, which duty was by the latter act differentiated as to each kind of liquor, the average being reduced.

The act of 1791 (7 Id., 268) gave the power of granting licenses to the County Courts then created. After their disestablishment by the act of 1799 (Id., 299), that power was given the Commissioners of Roads.

By act of 1801 (5 Id., 399) the power of licensing liquor-selling was vested in the Commissioners of Roads, at discretion, the proceeds to be used on the roads. Tavern licenses cost $10 and licenses to retail not less than a quart (not at a tavern) $15. Selling without license was fined $100.

Sales of liquors within one mile of places of worship during service, except by regular licensed dealers, were fined $50 by act of 1809. (Id., 599.)

The Screen Law of 1839.—By act of 1835 (Id., 528) licensees were required to give bond in $1,000 to observe the law, and were required to keep their places without screens or obstructions, so the vending should be done openly, upon penalty of $50 to $200. A $50 license fee was required.

Delivering liquor to a slave, except upon the written order of the master, was punished by imprisonment not exceeding six months and fine not exceeding $100 (Laws, 1834, 7 Id., 469), and those licensed were first required to take oath not to so sell; and if a negro entered defendant's place without the article and left with it, that fact was sufficient evidence.

By the act of 1842 (Laws, p. 295), the Court might imprison for not exceeding six months, instead of the fine then imposed by law.

The act of 1849 (Laws, p. 557) granted retail licenses to tavern-keepers only; and upon recommendation of at least three respectable freeholders of the neighborhood, or in incorporated towns by six, they were strictly required to have tavern accommodations for travellers. Bond in $1,000 was required. It was made unlawful for anyone licensed to retail liquors to sell such liquors in quantities less than one quart, nor did retail licenses authorize the drinking such liquors at the place where sold.

War Provisions.—Distillation from grain was prohibited and punished by forfeiture of apparatus, imprisonment six months to two years, and a fine of $1,000 to $5,000; but agents to distil for medical purposes only, under the Governor's direction, might be appointed by the Governor. (Laws, 1862–3, p. 111.) This act was extended to distillation from anything but fruits in their season, and the permits before granted by the Governor were revoked, and the Governor was authorized to license only one or more such agents for the same purposes, and then only if liquor could not otherwise be procured. (Id., p. 113.) Such agents (not to exceed one in each judicial district) were subject to strict limitations. (Laws, 1863, p. 198.)

Since the War.—Peddling spirits was prohibited by Laws of 1870, No. 274.

A general license law (1872, No. 155) included licenses to sell liquors. The tax on taverns and saloons to retail was graded according to rental value of the places, at from $37.50 to $375. By Laws of 1874, No. 646, the provisions of the general law relating to the granting of licenses were declared to be applicable only to the incorporated limits of cities, towns and villages. This law, with some additions, is now in force.

Considerable numbers of local Prohibitory laws have been passed within the last few years in South Carolina.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—No license for the sale of intoxicating liquor shall be granted outside of the incorporated cities, towns and villages, and it shall be unlawful for any person to sell such liquors without license. (G. S., 1882, § 1731.)

No license shall be granted by any municipal authorities, except upon payment to the Treasurer of the county of $100. (Id., § 1732.)

The sale of all wines, fruits prepared with spirituous liquors, or other beverages, of which spirituous liquor forms an ingredient, is hereby prohibited except in incorporated places. (Id., § 1733.)

Domestic wine made from grapes or berries grown within the State may be sold by the makers in quantities not less than a quart, put up in bottles, casks or demijohns containing not less than a quart, labelled with the name of the said maker. (Laws, 1885, p. 359.)

Any person violating the general law, or any special law regarding the sale of liquors, shall be fined not over $200, or imprisoned not exceeding six months, or both (half of the fines going to the informer.) (Laws, 1885, p. 415, amending G. S., 1882, § 1734.)

No license may issue in any city, town or village where the sale is prohibited by act of the Legislature or by ordinance of the municipality. (Id., § 1735.)

Nothing herein prohibits sale by licensed distillers in the original packages of not less than 10 gallons upon the premises of manufacture. (Id.)

Municipal authorities may grant license to retail to keepers of drinking-saloons and eating-houses, apart from taverns, and fix the price of the same at not less than $75, the person to be first recommended by six respectable taxpayers of the neighborhood, and to give bond in $1,000 for the keeping of an orderly house and the observance of the law. (Id., § 1736.)

Municipal authorities may grant licenses for retailing wine, cider, brewed or malt liquors upon payment of $25, and recommendation as above, and bond in $500 as above, on condition that such licensees shall not keep spirituous liquors or any mixture thereof. (Id., § 1737.)

Wilfully furnishing intoxicating drink to any person of known intemperate habits, or person when drunk, or to a minor or insane person, for use as a beverage, shall be deemed a misdemeanor, and it shall be lawful for any relative or guardian of such intemperate person or minor, or the committee of such insane person, or for any trial Justice of the township, to give notice to any seller not to furnish liquor to such person; and if he do so within three months he shall be responsible for injury to person or property resulting, and a wife may recover for loss of means of support. (Id., § 1738.)

Any person found drunk in any public place shall be fined not exceeding $5, and the person who sold the liquor to be drunk on the premises which caused the intoxication shall be liable in $5 to the wife, parent, child or guardian of such person found intoxicated. (Id., § 1739.)

Whenever any riot or breach of the peace occurs in any drinking-place the keeper shall be deemed an aider and abettor thereof, and shall be liable as such unless he can show it was not caused by persons becoming intoxicated on his premises. (Id., § 1740.)

No person shall trade in liquors on Sunday. (Id., § 1741.)

The municipal authorities of incorporated cities, towns and villages have power to grant licenses to sell by the quart, and any person so licensed, who shall permit the liquor so sold to be drunk on the premises, shall forfeit his license, and it shall not be renewed for a year. No license shall be issued until the receipt of the County Treasurer for the license fee is presented. (Id., § 1742.)

No druggists shall, except upon prescriptions, sell any bitters of which spirituous or malt liquor is an ingredient, or any medicated liquors by the bottle or drink, unless licensed, when they may sell as in cases of those licensed to sell by the quart. (Id., § 1743; amended by Laws of 1884, No. 495.)

In all cases the Court before which any fine is recovered under this chapter shall award to the prosecutor a reasonable share thereof for his trouble, not exceeding one-third. (G. S., 1882, § 1744.)

All licensed persons shall expose their licenses to public view in their chief places of business. Any person convicted of retailing without license, or on the Sabbath, shall not be entitled to license for two years. And every licensee shall sell in a room fronting the public street, without any screen or device for preventing the passing public from fully viewing what may be transpiring within. (§ 1745.)

Whenever one-third of the number of voters at the preceding municipal election shall petition (before the 15th of November in any year) for an election upon the question of license, the Council shall submit the question at a special election, on or about Dec. 1 following, and if a majority voting is in favor of no-license, none shall be granted then for the ensuing two years. (Id., § 1747; amended by Laws of 1884, No. 246.)

All licenses shall be so granted as to end on the 31st day of December. (Id., § 1747.)

Whenever a vote has been taken as above, the decision shall stand until reversed by another vote.

Sections 1746, 1747 and 1748 do not apply to any city, town or village in which the sale of liquor is prohibited by legislative enactment. (Id., § 1749; amended by Laws of 1884, No. 419.)

Whenever at any such election as above, the vote is in favor of no-license, no druggist may sell liquor except upon a physician's prescription, which shall be filed one year by the druggist. (G. S., 1882, § 1750.) No physician shall give such a prescription except when actually in *bona fide* attendance upon a patient. (Id., § 1751.)

Saloons must be closed from 6 o'clock of the evening preceeding the day of election until 6 o'clock of the morning of the day after, and the sale of liquor is prohibited during that time, upon penalty of fine not exceeding $50 or imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both. (Id., § 114.)

No trial Justice shall retail liquor, upon penalty of $250 and disqualification for the office. (Id., § 801.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by a two-thirds vote of all the members of both Houses; to be concurred in by a majority of the electors voting at the next general election; and then, in order to be adopted, must be ratified by two-thirds of each House in the next Legislature.

South Dakota.

No person or corporation shall manufacture or aid in the manufacture for sale, any intoxicating liquor; no person shall sell or keep for sale, as a beverage, any intoxicating liquor. The Legislature shall by law prescribe regulations for the enforcement of the provisions of this section, and provide suitable and adequate penalties for the violation thereof. (Const., art. 24.)

The Legislature of 1890 passed an elaborate Prohibitory statute in compliance with this article. Not being available at the time that this is prepared for the press, the provisions of the act cannot be stated here; but they will be found summarized on p.614.

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by majority vote of all the members of the two Houses, at one session; popular vote to be taken at the next general election for Representatives, 12 weeks' notice to be given. A majority carries it.

Tennessee.

Early Provisions.—Tavern-keepers encouraging gaming or horse-racing, or furnishing liquor in connection with gambling or horse-racing, were fined $10, with forfeiture of license and disqualification to receive another one for one year. (Laws, 1799, c. 8.) Ordinary licenses were taxed $5. (Id., c. 30.)

In 1811 licenses were to be granted by the Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, to those not of gross immorality, for $3; and selling without license was fined $1 to $3, and constables were to give information against offenders. (Laws, 1811, c. 113.)

In 1813 persons selling drink capable of producing intoxication to slaves, without permits in writing, were to be fined $5 to $10. (Laws, 1813, c. 135.)

In 1817 ordinary-keepers, before receiving license, were to be sworn not to permit gaming of any kind. (Laws, 1817, c. 61, § 5.)

In 1821 all laws prohibiting the sale of ale, beer, cider and methylin by retail, were repealed. (Laws, 1821, c. 18.)

No Licenses to be Granted to Persons Whose Principal Object was the Retailing of Liquors (1823).—In 1823 no license was to be granted unless the applicant proved in open Court his good character, and that he had adequate tavern accommodations; and no license was to be granted if the principal object was the retailing of liquors. (Laws, 1823, c. 33.)

Those at whose houses elections or musters were held might sell liquor on such days. (Laws, 1827, c. 15.)

In 1831 the Clerk of the County Court was required to grant licenses, upon payment of $25. (Laws, 1831, c. 80.)

In 1835 an oath not to sell to slaves was required before license could be obtained. (Laws, 1835, c. 34.) An additional oath not to allow gaming was required. (Laws, 1835, c. 25.)

Repeal of all License Laws (1838).—The act of 1838 (Laws, c. 122) repealed the acts authorizing the granting of licenses, and provided that all persons convicted of the offense of retailing spirituous liquors should be fined at the discretion of the Court. (Passed Jan. 26, 1838.)

In 1841 (Laws, c. 141), selling liquor to free persons of color, or to slaves (to be drunk on the premises) was forbidden as a misdemeanor, and so was any sale to a slave without permission of his master, even though the liquor were not drunk on the premises.

By act of 1845 (Laws, c. 90) tippling-houses were taxed $25 if the stock of the establishment did not exceed $250, and $10 for each $100 of stock. Incorporated towns and counties might each exact an equal tax. A similar tax on all purchases of stock was imposed. It was made a misdemeanor to sell without license. An oath was required, before license issued, not to sell to slaves, permit gaming or sell on Sunday. Buying liquor for negroes was made a misdemeanor by Laws of 1851, c. 174.

Licenses were placed at $50 in country places, $70 in towns of 1,000 to 5,000 inhabitants and $100 in larger places, with the privilege accorded to incorporated places and counties to duplicate such fees. (Laws, 1869, c. 38.)

The Four Mile law, which is the most important later act, was passed in 1877.

Submission of Constitutional Prohibition (1887).—A Constitutional Amendment, prohibiting the manufacture and sale as a beverage of intoxicating liquors, was by Laws of 1885, p. 349, proposed, concurred in, voted upon and defeated in 1887.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—The right to sell spirituous, vinous or fermented liquors in quantities less than a quart, or in larger quantities (to be drunk at the place of sale), is a taxable privilege in the sense of § 28, art. 2, of the Constitution. (Id., § 857.) This privilege shall not be exercised without license from the Clerk of the County Court. (Id., § 858.) No license shall be granted to a person incompetent as a witness, to a person convicted of keeping disorderly house or permitting gaming under former license, or to one twice convicted of unlawfully selling to minors or habitual drunkards or within a year from his first conviction thereof. (Id., § 859.) License shall be granted upon condition that the applicant deliver the Clerk a sworn statement of the value of his stock of liquors; that he execute bond in $500 to obey the law, and within 12 months state to the Clerk the amount of purchases since the license was issued and pay the taxes thereon for the use of the State, town or county, and that he will take oath not to permit gaming. (Id., § 860.) No person shall sell any liquor until he has taken oath and given bond in $500 not to adulterate the liquor he sells. (Id., § 861.) At the end of a year the license may be renewed if the applicant has complied with the law, gives new bonds and takes the oath again. (Id., § 862.) Licenses without the oath endorsed and subscribed by the licensees are void. (Id., § 863.)

No person shall be a clerk in a liquor place who is not a competent witness in Court. (Id., § 864.) Such clerk shall take oath not to sell to minors or permit gaming. (Id., § 865.)

Each liquor-dealer pays a tax of $150; in towns of 5,000 inhabitants or over, $200; and this applies to druggists. (Id., § 617.) Wholesalers pay $150. (Id.) They also pay an ad valorem tax upon their capital at tax levy rates. (Id., § 614.)

It is a misdemeanor to sell spirituous or vinous liquors in less quantity than a quart, or in larger quantity, to be drunk on the premises without a license. (Code, 1884, § 5667.) Any person who after having taken out a license violates the oath taken is guilty of perjury. (Id., § 5668.) If any licensed person violate any law regulating license, he is guilty of a misdemeanor. (Id., § 5669.) The provisions of this article are to be construed liberally, so as to prevent evasions and subterfuges and to effectuate the objects thereof. (Id., § 5670.)

No licensed grocer or other person shall sell liquor on Sunday, the punishment to be at the discretion of the Court. (Id., § 5671.)

Any person who sells any student liquor, or anyone for him, without consent of parent or guardian, is guilty of a misdemeanor. (Id., § 5672.) It is unlawful for persons to sell to or procure liquors for minors without the written consent of the parents or mother and guardian of such minor, or the principal of any school he attends; also to sell to any husband who is a habitual drunkard after notice prohibitory thereof from the wife, upon penalty of $10 to $200, and persons so selling shall forfeit their licenses and be disqualified 12 months to receive new ones, and on second offenses shall be forever disqualified. (Id., §§ 5673–7.)

It is unlawful to sell any intoxicating beverage within four miles of an incorporated institution of learning, upon penalty of $100 to $250 and imprisonment one to six months. This does not apply to incorporated towns. (Id., §§ 5679–80.) It is not lawful to sell liquor within four miles of any school-house, public or private, whether the school is in session or not, upon penalty of $10 to $100 and imprisonment not more than six months, this not applying to incorporated towns. (Laws, 1887, c. 167.) No person shall keep for sale or sell any liquor within two miles of any hospital for the insane, on penalty of not over $50 and imprisonment at discretion. (Code, 1884, § 5681.) It is an indictable offense to enter the premises of such hospital drunk; penalty, $25 and imprisonment at discretion. (Id., § 5682.)

It is a misdemeanor to adulterate for sale any wine, spirituous or malt liquors, or knowingly sell the same, and a felony to so adulterate them with poisons. (Id., §§ 5632–3.)

Selling liquor (except in incorporated towns) within five miles of any furnace or factory of any kind, established by any foreign corporation (Id., § 2002), or selling within one mile of any place of public worship, except at a regular place of such business, is punishable by fine of $10. (Id., §§ 2011–2.)

Being drunk on Sunday is punished the same as working on that day. (Id., § 2290.)

In theatres no liquor shall be sold, or in any connecting room, upon penalty of $50, and for second offense $50 and forfeiture of license. (Id., § 2295.)

It is unlawful for any person to sell liquor within one-half mile of any fair-grounds during the time of holding the fair, without consent of the directors, upon penalty of $50 to $200 and imprisonment one to three months; but this does not apply to a regular business. (Id., §§ 2296–8.)

No jailer shall permit any prisoner to have more than half a pint of spirits in any 24 hours, under penalty of $50. (Id., § 6293.) No spirituous liquor shall be introduced into the Penitentiary, except for the families of the officers or for the hospital under the directions of the physician. (Id., § 6388.)

The notice by a wife not to sell to her husband (if he is a habitual drunkard) shall be served and a due return made thereon to the Clerk of the County Court by the Sheriff or any constable of the county. Persons disregarding the notice shall be fined $10 to $200.

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed (not oftener than once in six years) by a majority vote of all the members of the two Houses; to be concurred in by two-thirds of each House in the next Legislature; a popular vote equal to a majority of those voting for Representatives is requisite for its adoption.

Texas.

Early Provisions.—The Republic of Texas by its 6th Congress taxed liquor-selling in quantities of a quart or over $25; retailing, $100. (Laws, 1842, p. 107.) Introducing liquor among the Indians was prohibited by Laws of 1843, p. 24.

The retail license tax was made $50 by the first Legislature of the State. (Laws, 1846, p. 147.)

County Local Option (1854).—The question of the abolition of the sale of liquor was submitted to the counties; in any county voting in favor of license, if 50 voters should petition for another election within a year it should be taken. Selling contrary to the act was fined $10 to $20. (Laws, 1854, c. 88.)

That act was repealed and license was substituted, the fee being $250, with bond in $1,000 and restrictions of sales to minors and slaves, and of gaming; penalty for selling without license, $50 to $200. (Laws, 1856, c. 66.) Local prohibitions were enacted both in 1854 and 1856.

War Provisions.—County Courts were given power to prohibit distillation when prejudicial to public subsistence, but not to deprive distillers of legal licenses without adequate compensation. (Laws, 1863, c. 65.) By the act of 1864 (Laws, c. 11), the occupation of distilling was charged with a license fee of $1,000; that of retailing liquor, $250.

In 1866 license was put at $300, and the penalty of selling without license was $100 to $200 and imprisonment 30 days. (Laws, 1866, c. 70.)

By the Constitution of 1869 (art. 12, § 48), the Legislature might prohibit the sale of liquor in the immediate vicinity of any college or seminary of learning, if not at the capital or at a county-seat.

The Bell-Punch law for collecting a tax on each drink sold was enacted in 1879 (Laws, c. 66); repealed the next session.

The Laws of 1887, p. 155, submitted a Prohibitory Constitutional Amendment, which was lost.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—"The Legislature shall enact a law whereby the qualified voters of any county, Justice's precinct, town or city, by a majority vote from time to time, may determine whether the sale of intoxicating liquors shall be prohibited within the prescribed limits." (Const., art. 16, § 20.)

The Commissioners' Court of each county in the State may order an election by the voters of said county or of any Justice's precinct, town or city therein, to determine whether or not the sale of liquor shall be permitted therein. It is the duty of said Court to order such election when petitioned for by 200 voters in any county, or 50 in precincts, towns or cities. (R. S., 1888, art. 3227.) The preceding article shall not prohibit the sale of wines for sacramental purposes, or alcoholic stimulants as medicines in cases of actual sickness, when sold upon prescription of a regular practicing physician with his certificate. One sale only shall be made on each prescription, which shall be stamped, cancelled and filed. (Id., art. 3228.) When the Court shall order the election, it shall be at the regular polling-places from 15 to 30 days from the date of the order, which shall be *prima facie* evidence of regularity. (Id., art. 3229.) Notice of the election shall be posted 20 days in five places. (Id., art. 3230.) Ballots shall be "For Prohibition," and "Against Prohibition." (Id., art. 3231.) The election shall be conducted under general election laws, and returns made to the Court ordering it. (Id., art. 3232.)

The Court shall hold a special session to count the votes, and if the majority be "For Prohibition" the Court shall issue an order declaring the result and absolutely prohibiting the sale within the prescribed limits, except for the above excepted purposes, until a contrary vote. (Id., art. 3233.) The order of the Court shall be published four weeks, in a newspaper of the county, or if there is none, posted in three places within the limits prescribed. (Id., art. 3234.) If a majority vote against

Prohibition the Court shall make an order declaring that result. (Id., art. 3235.) No election shall again be held for two years, and then as before. (Id., art. 3236.) The failure to carry Prohibition in a county shall not prevent an election from being immediately held in a precinct, town or city thereof, nor shall such failure in a town or city prevent an election immediately thereafter in the precinct or county wherein it is situated. But when Prohibition carries in any county no election in any precinct, city or town thereof, shall be ordered until Prohibition is defeated in the entire county and so for a precinct. (Id., art. 3238.) Selling liquor or giving it away to evade the law after the above order of Prohibition is punished by the Penal Code. (Id., art. 3239.) Within 30 days any citizen may contest the election in any Court of competent jurisdiction, and the Court may declare the election void and order another. (Id., art. 3239 *a*.) Where anyone has a license cut off by the order of Prohibition, he shall have refunded to him an amount proportionate to his unexpired term. (Id., art. 3239 *b*.)

District Judges shall give the Local Option law in charge to the Grand Juries. Where any hidden device is resorted to a Justice of the Peace may issue a warrant to search the place and force it open, if necessary, and arrest the person violating the law. (Id., art. 3239 *c*.)

There shall be levied upon the business of selling spirituous, vinous or malt liquors, or medicated bitters in quantities less than a quart, $300; between one quart and five gallons, $200; over five gallons, $300; for malt liquors exclusively, $50. But wholesale dealers and merchants may sell in unbroken packages containing less than five gallons without licenses as quart dealers. (Id., art. 3226 *a*, § 1.)

The Commissioners' Courts of the Counties may levy taxes equal to one-half the State taxes, and any city or incorporated town may in addition levy another tax equal to that levied by the Commissioners. (Id., art. 3226 *a*, § 2.) All these taxes must be paid in advance. (Id., § 3.)

Anyone desiring to engage in such business must give bond in $5,000 to keep an open, quiet and orderly house, and to obey all the law whose prohibitions are enumerated in the bond; which said bond may be sued on at the instance of any person aggrieved by the violation of any of its provisions, and such person shall recover $500 as liquidated damages, and said bond shall not be void on the first recovery but may be sued on until the full penal sum is exhausted. It is also the duty of the County and District Attorneys to sue such bonds in cases of violation of law and recover $500. Whenever a bond is exhausted by suits, a new one must be provided, or whenever a bond promises to be exhausted by a suit brought, and if on notice the new bond is not given, the right to sell ceases. This section does not repeal the penal laws concerning the sale of liquor. An open house is one in which no screen or other device is used or placed so as to obstruct the view through the open door or place of entrance into such house. A quiet house is one in which no music, loud talking, yelling or indecent language is allowed, or any noise to disturb neighbors or passers-by. An orderly house is one in which no prostitute or lewd woman is allowed to enter or remain, which house must contain no obscene pictures. (Id., § 4.)

The County Clerk shall issue license upon receipt for the above taxes and bond required. (Id., § 5.) A Collector of Taxes knowingly permitting anyone to pursue such business without paying the tax shall be fined $25 to $200, but it is a defense for him if he has reported the matter to the District Attorney. (Id., § 6.)

The Comptroller shall furnish blank forms of licenses and bonds and receipts for taxes herein. (Id., § 7.)

The license shall be posted in some conspicuous place where the business is done, upon penalty of not exceeding $25 per day or the amount of the tax. (Id., §§ 8–12.)

City Councils have power to restrain, regulate and prohibit the sale of liquor, except by licensed persons, and selling to minors and drunkards, to close saloons on Sunday and prescribe hours for closing them, and to prevent sales of liquor where theatrical representations are given. (Id., arts. 390–3.)

Selling liquor to Indians is fined $10 to $100. (Pen. Code, 1888, §§ 611–12.) Selling to minors knowingly without written consent of parent or guardian is fined $25 to $100. (Id., § 613.) Selling by the quart or more, and permitting the same drunk on the premises, is fined $50 to $200. (Id., § 616.) Selling in prohibited districts is punished by fine of $25 to $100, and by imprisonment 20 to 60 days. (Id., § 618.)

Failure to cancel prescriptions used to procure liquors, and permitting liquor bought upon prescription to be drunk on the premises, are fined $25 to $100. (Id., § 620.) Anyone giving a prescription when not a physician, or being such and interested in the sale of the liquor, or for one not sick or actually examined, shall be fined $25 to $100 and imprisoned 20 to 60 days. (Id., § 62.)

If anyone shall keep or run a "blind tiger" or other device whereby the party selling or delivering is concealed from the buyer, he shall be imprisoned two to 12 months and fined $100 to $500, and upon complaint describing the place where any "blind tiger" is run a warrant shall issue to search the place and arrest the persons violating the law, by force if necessary. A United States "license" posted in a place where a "blind tiger" is kept is *prima facie* proof that the person named therein is running such "blind tiger." (Id., § 622.)

The subsequent reversal of a local Prohibition does not exempt an offender against it while in force. (Id., § 623.)

Where persons are jointly indicted for selling it is sufficient to show they were reputed to be in partnership. (Id., § 626.) Any member of a firm is separately liable for selling by the firm. (Id., § 627.) Where any establishment is conducted without the name of the owner being known, all persons found selling therein are subject to separate prosecution. (Id., § 628.)

A disorderly house is one where liquors are sold and prostitutes and lewd women are employed or permitted to display themselves. And the keeper thereof is liable in $200 per day; and the owner of the property, with knowledge, is also liable. (Laws, 1889, c. 38, amending Pen. Code, arts. 339 and 341.)

Keeping open saloons or selling or giving liquor within three miles of any voting precinct is fined $100 to $500. (Pen. Code, 1888, §§ 178–9.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by a two-thirds vote of all the members of each House, at one session; popular vote to be taken at any date fixed by the Legislature, three months' notice to be given. A majority vote carries it.

Utah Territory.

Early Provisions.—An inspection law for liquors was passed in 1852. (Laws, c. 58 of Laws, 1851–70.)

The County Courts were authorized to grant licenses to manufacture and sell liquor and to fix the price of the same. The penalty for violating the act was a fine not exceeding $100.

Sales on Sunday were forbidden upon penalty not to exceed $25. (Laws, 1860, c. 69, Id.)

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—There shall be a Territorial Inspector of spirituous liquors (C. L., 1888, §§ 2149–50.) All spirituous liquors manufactured or imported into this Territory before being offered for sale shall be inspected. (Id., §§ 2151–2.) Any person selling liquor not inspected shall forfeit not exceeding $500. (Id., § 2155.) No person shall manufacture or sell intoxicating liquors without obtaining license from the County Court or City Council. (Id., § 2156.) Such authorities are authorized to grant license upon application signed, and stating the place of business proposed. Before license the applicant must give bond in $100 to $1,000 to keep an orderly house, permit no gaming and pay all damages, fines and forfeitures adjudged against him. (Id., § 2157.) The said licensing authorities shall, upon each petition, determine the amount to be paid for the license, not less than $600 nor more than $1,200 per year; but licensees of the same class shall pay a uniform amount in the city or county. No license shall be for less than three months. (Id., § 2158.) Upon payment of the amount so determined, the Clerk of the County Court or City Recorder shall issue the license, which is not transferable. (Id., § 2159.)

Any person licensed, who shall knowingly dispose of liquor to an Indian, insane or idiotic person, or to any minor, apprentice or employee under 21, or permit any of said persons to remain in his place of business without consent of the parents, guardians or employer, shall be fined $10 to $100. (Id., § 2160.)

Any person selling liquor on Sunday, except for medical purposes upon prescription, or who shall permit gaming on his premises where liquor is sold, or shall permit dancing, drunkenness or disorderly conduct in his saloon, shall be fined not less than $300, or imprisoned not exceeding six months, or both. (Id., § 2161.) Any married woman may maintain a suit on the seller's bond for any damages sustained by herself or her children on account of the traffic. (Id., § 2162.)

Liquor bills for quantities less than five gallons at a time, not for medical, mechanical or sacramental purposes, are not collectible. (Id., § 2164.)

Persons selling liquor without license shall be fined not more than $300, or be imprisoned not exceeding six months, or both, and shall be liable as though licensed. (Id., § 2165.)

Suits for damages under $300 may be before Justices of the Peace, and different persons may sue on the bond until it is exhausted. (Id., § 2166.)

This does not authorize County Courts to interfere with the charter rights of municipalities to tax, regulate, restrain and prohibit the manufacture and sale of liquor, or to prohibit wine-growers from expressing and selling on the same premises the pure juice of the grape in quantities not less than five gallons at a time; and nothing herein impairs any municipal right to prohibit manufacture and sale. (Id., § 2168.)

Furnishing liquor on election day is prohibited. (Id., §§ 2169–70.)

Amusements and theatricals at a saloon on Sunday are prohibited. (Id., § 4514.) So is keeping open Sunday, upon penalty of $5 to $100. (Id., § 4515.)

Sale of liquors at theaters, and employing women for that purpose, are prohibited. (Id., § 4518.)

Selling liquor within one mile of camp and field meetings, except by one carrying on his regular business, is fined $5 to $500. (Id., §§ 4522–3.)

Employing a female to play any musical instrument, dance or exhibit herself in any drinking-saloon, is fined not exceeding $300, or punished by imprisonment not exceeding three months, or both. (Id., §§ 4524–5.)

Selling liquor to a minor under 16 years of age is punishable by fine not exceeding $100, or imprisonment not exceeding three months. (Id., § 4526.)

Selling liquor to an Indian is a misdemeanor (Id., § 4586); so is adulterating liquor for sale. (Id., § 4574.)

Vermont.

Early Provisions.—A law of 1779 (Laws of Vermont, 1779–86, p. 331) provided that if any person were found drunken, so that he was thereby bereaved and disabled in the use of his reason, appearing either in his speech, gesture or behavior, he should forfeit 8*s*. A law of the same year (Id., p. 370) provided that the magistrates, Selectmen, constables and Grand Jurymen of the towns might in March annually nominate for license a suitable person or persons to keep houses of public entertainment, to the next County Court, which Court might lessen the number or refuse license to unfit persons. The persons licensed were to give bonds in £100 to obey the law. Persons idly haunting taverns were to be posted therein, and no liquors were to be sold them under penalty of £3. And if any such person did not leave off his evil practices, he was to find surety for his good behavior, or pay a fine of 20*s*, or sit in the stocks two hours. Selling without license was fined £3, the amount to be doubled with each subsequent offense, half to the informer.

Licensed persons were recommended to prosecute under the provisons of the law, and Grand Jurymen were to search for and make presentments against those so selling, who might be caused to give bond in £10 not to sell without license.

In 1787 tavern-keepers were not allowed to suffer gaming about their places, upon penalty of £5 (half to the informer). (R. S., Bennington, 1791, p. 50.)

The law of Nov. 2, 1798 (Laws, 1824, p. 486), revised this law (a revision in 1787 not having changed it), and imposed a license fee of $1 to $30, according to profits. Provisions for tavern accommodations for travellers were added, but the provision for posting frequenters was not repeated. Revocation of license for not obeying the law, and not keeping an orderly house, was also provided, and the penalty for selling without license was made $10, to be doubled with each offense. The Selectmen were empowered to grant licenses for musters and public occasions.

In 1802 (Laws, c. 105), licenses to retail wines and foreign spirits were authorized to be given by the County Courts, on payment of $1.50 to $15. This was repealed as to wines by Laws of 1817, c. 141. The law of 1804, c. 45, authorized the County Courts to grant tavern licenses without nomination by the civil authorities of the town, as well as upon such nomination, and the penalty for selling without license was placed at $10 for every offense. The restrictions on selling metheglin, strong beer, ale and cider, in quantities not less than one gallon, were repealed by Laws of 1814, c. 102. The provision for posting in taverns the names of tipplers with prohibitions to sell to them was revived, with a fine of $7, by Laws of 1821, c. 18.

By Laws of 1829, No. 14, license to sell domestic spirits as well as foreign was required, but one license covered both privileges.

By Laws of 1830, No. 16, licenses were required for keeping victualling-houses and selling beer, ale and cider, but without fee. The former laws were all repealed by Laws of 1833, No. 22. This act provided for licenses to keep taverns or retail liquors, such licenses to be granted by the civil authorities of towns, as before mentioned, for $3 to $50 for inn-keepers, and $10 to $100 for retailers. All the former special provisions were included, and the penalty for selling without license was $10, to be doubled for each subsequent offense. By the Laws of 1834, No. 14, this act was repealed and none was substituted therefor. It would seem that this repeal was held to revive the former law, for that law was revised in 1840 as still in force.

The act of 1838, No. 26, enacted that no County Court or Judge thereof should grant a license to retail spirits, except as provided by the law of 1798.

The provisions as to granting licenses to retailers of foreign and domestic spirits, by the County Courts directly, as revived, were repealed by Laws of 1843, No. 23.

The act of 1844 (Laws, No. 15) repealed c. 83, R. S., relating to licenses, and provided for licenses to be granted by an elective County Board of three Commissioners. The license fees were nominal, $2 to $6 for retailers and $20 for wholesalers. Provision was made also for the licensing of one or more persons in each town to sell for medicinal, chemical or mechanical purposes only. The penalties imposed by the act were generally $10.

Local Option (1846) *and Prohibition* (1850, 1852).—The act of 1846, No. 24, contained a section providing for an annual vote on the question of license or no-license for the entire State, licenses to issue to anyone of good moral character applying, or to designated persons in each town, to sell for the excepted purposes only, as the vote should determine.

In 1850 (Laws, No. 30), former acts were repealed and a short Prohibitory act, authorizing one or two licenses in each town, to sell for the excepted purposes only, was passed. The penalties were $10 and $20.

A regular Prohibitory or Maine law was enacted in 1852, which has been retained to this day, though it has been considerably amended.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—A County Commissioner shall be chosen annually upon the general county ticket. (R. L., 1880, § 3787; amended by Laws of 1886, No. 35.) Such Commissioner shall hold office two years from the 1st day of December following his election, and shall receive for his services $3 per day and his expense account, not exceeding $50 annually. (R. L., 1880, § 3790; amended by Laws of 1886, No. 35 and Laws of 1888, No. 40.) If such Commissioner receive any reward for appointing anyone Agent to sell liquors, he shall forfeit $100 to $1,000 and be imprisoned six months, and the person offering the same shall be punished likewise. (R. L., 1880, § 3791.) The County Commissioner may appoint an Agent for any town in his county, to sell intoxicating liquor to be used for medicinal, chemical and mechanical purposes only. No inn-keeper or keeper of a house of public entertainment shall be appointed such Agent. (R. L., 1880, § 3792; amended by Laws of 1886, No. 35.) Such Agent shall receive a certificate from the Commissioner authorizing him as the Agent of the town, to sell liquor for such excepted purposes, but only after he has given bond in $600 to observe the law. (R. L., 1880, § 3793.) The Selectmen of the town shall furnish the Agent liquor and fix the price at which it is to be sold, as near as may be the actual cost and expenses of sale, the money received to go to the town. (R. L., 1880, § 3794; amended by Laws of 1882, No. 46.) The Selectmen in fixing the compensation of the Agent shall not make an inducement to him to increase his sales, upon penalty of $100 to $500. (R. L., 1880, § 3795.) If the Town Agent procures liquor and sells it without making a contract with the Selectmen as to compensation, he shall be liable as a common seller. (R. L., 1880, § 3796.) If the Agent sells at an exorbitant profit, the Commissioner, on application of three voters of such town, shall annul his license. (Id., § 3797.) When complaint is made to the Commissioner that an Agent has violated the terms of his license, he shall notify such Agent, and on hearing, revoke his appointment and cause his bond to be prosecuted. (Id., § 3798.) If anyone procures or attempts to procure any liquor of an Agent by false representations, or by any deceit, he shall forfeit $10. (Id., § 3799; amended by Laws of 1888, No. 39.)

No person shall, except as specially provided, manufacture, sell, furnish or give away spirituous or intoxicating liquor or mixed liquor of which a part is spirituous, or intoxicating or malt liquors or lager beer; and the phrase "intoxicating liquor" shall include such liquors and beer and fermented cider. The word "furnish" shall apply to cases where a person knowingly brings into and transports within the State for another person liquor intended to be sold contrary to law, or to be divided among others. The words "give away" do not apply to the giving away of liquor by a person in his own private dwelling, unless given to a minor other than a member of his own private family, or to a habitual drunkard, or unless such dwelling becomes a place of public resort. No one shall furnish liquor at a raising, removal of a building or a public gathering for amusement. Nothing shall prevent the manufacture, sale and use of wine for the sacrament, or of cider, or of liquors for medical purposes only, or of wine from grapes and fruits of the State not mixed with alcohol or spirituous liquor, or the manufacture by anyone for his own use of fermented liquor; but no one shall sell fermented cider at any place of public resort or to a habitual drunkard. (R. L., 1880, § 3800; amended by Laws of 1882, No. 41.)

Payments for liquor sold unlawfully may be recovered, and no action shall be had for the recovery of liquor except as sold or purchased in accordance with this chapter. (R. L., 1880, § 3801.)

If anyone sells liquor in violation of law he shall forfeit $10; on second conviction $20 and be imprisoned one month, and on third $20 and be imprisoned three to six months. (Id., § 3802.) Justices have concurrent jurisdiction with the County Court under the above section, and the Grand Juror of the town or the State's Attorney may make complaint. (Id., § 3803.) The prosecuting officer shall allege prior convictions in his complaint and make proof of the same at the trial, upon penalty of $300 to $500. (Id., § 3804.) On plea of guilty the defendant may specify the number and dates of offenses, and such plea and judgment thereon is no bar to prosecution for other offenses before or after that time. (Id., §§ 3805–7.)

If any person sells adulterated liquor he shall forfeit $10 to $300. (Id., § 3809.)

A person who is a common seller of liquor, not being an Agent as above provided for, shall forfeit $100; for other convictions, $200, and on the third and subsequent convictions he shall also be imprisoned four to 12 months. (Id., § 3810.) No person shall be convicted as a common seller unless the number of sales exceeds five, or when the number of offenses proved exceeds 10, but in such cases the respondent shall be fined for each act of selling. (Id., § 3811.)

If a person is found intoxicated he shall pay $5, and on second conviction $10, and on third conviction $20 with imprisonment two months. (Id., § 3812; amended by Laws of 1888, No. 36.) When a person is so convicted the Court may put the respondent on his good behavior and delay committing him if for his and the public's best good. (R. L., 1880, § 3813.)

When a person is so intoxicated as to disturb the public or domestic peace, any officer may apprehend him without warrant and keep him in custody until he is capable of testifying. (Id., § 3814.) The officer shall give notice of such arrest, and of taking disclosure to the State's Attorney or Grand Juror. (Id., § 3815.)

The person arrested shall disclose the place where and person from whom the liquor was obtained, or be committed until he does, and the Grand Juror or State's Attorney shall prosecute the person accused. (Id., § 3816.) Upon disclosure, if the person intoxicated has been before convicted, he shall be sentenced as for the appropriate conviction. (Id., § 3817.) On such disclosure the costs thereof shall be taxed, but on conviction of the person accused the said costs shall be taxed against him. (Laws, 1888, No. 37.)

If any voter in a town make complaint that he has reason to believe liquor is kept anywhere for unlawful sale, the Justice shall issue a warrant to search the premises described and seize liquor found therein (R. L., 1880, § 3818; amended by Laws of 1882, No. 43), or any officer may seize without warrant and hold until he can get one. (Id.) The officer shall summon the owner of the liquor to appear forthwith before the Justice, and if the liquor is adjudged so unlawfully kept, it shall be forfeited to the town, or if unfit to be sold by the Agent for the excepted purposes, it shall be destroyed. (R. L., 1880, § 3819.) Costs shall be paid by the town if it accepts the liquor. (Laws, 1888, No. 37, § 5.) If the owner or keeper of such liquor is unknown to the officer it shall, upon being adjudged forfeited, be advertised two weeks. (Id., § 3820.) An officer upon information that liquor is kept for unlawful sale in any shanty or place on or near the ground of a cattle-show, muster or public occasion of any kind, may seize the liquor and apprehend the keeper and take both before a magistrate, and there make written complaint, and upon proof of guilt the defendant shall be sentenced to imprisonment 30 days and the liquor be forfeited. The claimant of seized liquors may file his claim and shall give bond to prosecute his claim, and he may appeal on bond to prosecute his appeal. (Id., §§ 3822–4.) If judgment is against the claimant he shall pay costs and the liquor be forfeited. (Id., § 3825.) So on appeal. (Id., § 3826.)

When liquor seized by an officer is taken from his possession by a writ of replevin, it shall not be delivered to the claimant, but be held by the replevying officer until replevin suit is determined. (Id., § 3827.) No proceedings except final execution shall be delayed by a replevin suit. (Id., § 3828.)

Nothing shall prevent a chemist, artist or manufacturer from keeping in his place all the distilled liquor he has occasion to use. (Id., § 3829.)

In all cases for the condemnation of liquor which result in the prosecution and conviction of the owner, the full cost shall be taxed against the owner. (Laws, 1888, No. 37.)

If anyone brings within the State liquor except for Town Agents he shall forfeit $20 and on second conviction $50 and be imprisoned three to 10 months. (R. L., 1880, § 3830.) If a railroad employee or any common carrier bring liquor into the State, unless the liquor is legibly marked with the name of the person to whom it is sent, he shall be fined $25. (Id., § 3831.)

Persons acting as agents, selling liquor for another, or who get orders for another, shall forfeit $100, on second conviction $300, and on third $500 and be imprisoned not more than six months. (Id., § 3832.)

Under these three last sections it shall not be necessary to state the names of principals, or from whom defendant took orders, or whom or how he assisted in the sale, but complaint may be in the terms of the statute. (Laws, 1882, No. 42.)

When a person by means of intoxication injures the person or property of another, the person who sold the liquor causing the intoxication is liable in damages therefor. Loss of means of support is included. (Id., § 3833.) When any person is imprisoned for intoxication, his wife or children may recover $2 a day of the seller of the liquor or the owner of the premises, if the latter knew of the traffic in liquor upon his premises. (Id., § 3834; amended by Laws of 1886, No. 36.) When any judgment is rendered on § 3834 the Judge shall order that the defendant be confined in close jail upon a close jail execution. (R. L., 1880, § 3835.)

Every drinking-place used as a place of resort shall be held a common nuisance. (Id., § 3836.) When it is proved liquor is kept or sold unlawfully in such a place, the Court shall adjudge it a nuisance, and that it be shut up and abated and the keeper be fined $20 to $200 or fined not exceeding $20 and imprisoned one to three months (Id., § 3837), and the Judge shall issue order for abatement (Id., § 3838), and the same place may again be abated on any subsequent conviction. (Id., § 3839.) The place so closed shall not be opened except upon bond in $300 to $500, conditioned not to so unlawfully sell, upon penalty of $10 per day. (Id., § 3840.) Any person may prosecute said bond if the State's Attorney neglects to do so six months after being notified to do so. (Id., § 3841.)

A tenant unlawfully selling liquor on the premises forfeits his rights thereto. (Id., § 3842.) A lessor knowingly permitting such use shall be fined $20 to $200. (Id., § 3843.)

No person engaged in the unlawful traffic in liquor shall sit on a jury in any case under this chapter. (Id., § 3844.)

Cases under this chapter shall have precedence of trial. (Id., § 3845.)

Where previous convictions are alleged they may be alleged in substance only. (Id., § 3846.)

When an officer whose duty it is to prosecute under this chapter neglects to do so, he shall be fined $20 to $100. (Id., § 3851.) A State's Attorney who settles a case hereunder forfeits $300 to $500. (Id., § 3852.) If a town refunds a fine for violation of this chapter it shall forfeit $100. (Id., § 3853.) One-fourth of the fines under this chapter go to the complainant or to the prosecuting officer. (Id., § 3854; amended by Laws of 1886, No. 41.)

No person other than the respondent shall be excused from testifying on the ground of incrimination, but the evidence shall not be used against him. (R. L., 1880, § 3856.)

The payment of the United States special tax is *prima facie* evidence of being a common seller and that the premises are a nuisance. (Laws, 1888, No. 35.)

There is a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. (Laws, 1886, No. 33.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by vote of two-thirds of the Senate, in any decennial year, to be concurred in by a majority of the House in the same year and also to be approved by a majority of each House in the next Legislature; a majority of the electors voting thereon is necessary to adoption.

Virginia.

Colonial Provisions.—The law of England against drunkenness was enacted in 1632. (1 Hennings Stats. at Large, p. 167.)

In 1644 rates charged by ordinaries were limited. (Id., p. 287.)

In 1655 the Commissioners of each county were authorized to license ordinaries. (Id., p. 411.)

In 1658 those guilty of drunkenness were made incapable of being witnesses or holding office. One convicted three times was accounted a common drunkard. (Id., p. 433.)

In 1668, only two ordinaries were to be licensed in each county. (2 Id., p. 268.) None were to be allowed except at James City, with two at ferries of York River, which could sell only beer and cider. Those selling contrary to law were fined 1,000 lbs. of tobacco. (Id., p. 361 [1676].)

In 1677 the County Courts were to grant but two licenses in each county, and those to taverns. (Id., p. 363.)

In 1734 licensees were to give bond in 10,000 lbs. of tobacco not to suffer gaming or anyone to tipple longer than necessary on Sunday, and selling without license was fined 2,000 lbs. of tobacco, or in default punished with 21 lashes well laid on. Each license cost 35*s* and was revoked for allowing such tippling or entertaining seamen or servants. (4 Id., p. 428.)

In 1779 £50 was added to the penalties then inflicted for keeping a tippling-house contrary to law (half to the informer); for a second offense six months' imprisonment was provided. (10 Id., p. 145.)

Early State Provisions.—In 1792 a general license law was passed, including the former regulations, requiring a bond in $150 and making the penalty for selling without license $30, and six months' imprisonment for second offense (half of the penalties to go to the informer). (1 Stats. at Large, N. S., p. 142.)

In 1831 no license was to be granted to retail liquors, except in incorporated towns, without certificate from the Court that the place was fit and convenient; and the Licensing Court might revoke license upon good cause shown, on notice to the accused. Selling to slaves was fined $50. (Laws, 1831, c. 24, amending Laws of 1830, c. 59.)

In 1840 the Revenue act taxed ordinaries $18 and 7 per cent. of the annual value above $200. (Laws, 1839–40, c. 1.) This amount was generally increased in each annual Revenue law until in 1861 it was $40 for all values less than $100, $50 from that to $200 and 15 per cent. of the excess in valuation. (Laws, 1861, c. 1.)

In 1842 (Laws, c. 6), a merchant who wished to retail liquor was required to get a certificate of good character from the Court of the corporation or county.

In 1847 (Laws, c. 10, § 32), selling liquor to a slave without the consent in writing of the master was fined $50, and a second offense $100 with forfeiture of license. Any master giving consent in such form that the slave might obtain liquor to sell for his own use was punished by fine not exceeding $50. (Id., § 33.)

By Acts of 1857 (Laws, cc. 62 and 63), liquor-dealers were required to give bonds not to sell to slaves or free negroes.

War Provisions.—Making spirituous or malt liquor out of grain was prohibited and punished by fine of $100 to $5,000 and imprisonment not exceeding 12 months, and the distillery and grain intended for such use were forfeited. (Laws, 1861–2, c. 84.) This act was amended so as to except liquor for medical and hospital purposes. (Laws, 1862, c. 12.) The act next preceding (c. 11) legalized the distillation of alcohol not less than 90 per cent. pure, for medical, chemical and manufacturing purposes only, the amount of the product to be reported to the Governor. This act was repealed by Laws of 1863, c. 55.

By Laws of 1863, c. 54, the act against distillation of grain was extended to potatoes, molasses and sugar; and by Laws of the called session (1863, c. 35) all contracts with the Confederate Government for the making of liquor were not allowed to be executed.

Licenses were not allowed to be granted within any city or town, or within five miles thereof, or at any depot station or point on any railroad. And sales without license were punished by forfeiture of the stock of liquors and personal property used in the conduct of the business, besides former penalties. (Laws, 1863–4, c. 48.)

Since the War.—After the war the license to sell liquor by wholesale and retail both was put at $100; by retail only, $40. (Laws, 1865–6, c. 3, § 24.)

The famous Bell-Punch or Moffatt Register law was first enacted in Virginia in 1877. (Laws, c. 253.) It dispensed with a general tax or license fee and provided for an instrument to register each drink sold, and for a tax of 2½ cents per drink for spirituous and ½ cent for malt liquors, and at these rates per half-pint for liquor sold in larger quantities up to one gallon. Failure to comply with the law was fined $20 to $100 (one-third to the informer).

By Laws of 1879, c. 59, the tax per drink on spirituous liquor was reduced one cent, and a specific tax of $30 on each license in places of less than 2,000 inhabitants and $60 in larger towns, or $25 and $50 for malt liquors alone, was imposed. The penalty of this act was $50 to $100, as above. Both laws provided taxes on wholesale and other licenses. These were superseded by Laws of 1880, c. 155.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—No person or club shall sell intoxicating liquors or any mixture thereof, alcoholic bitters, bitters containing alcohol, or fruits preserved in spirits without first obtaining license. A wholesale license shall authorize sales of five gallons or more, or one dozen jugs or bottles. A retail license authorizes sale in any quantity not exceeding five gallons (not to be drunk on the premises). A barroom license authorizes sales of liquor to be drunk on the premises. Ordinaries and malt liquor-saloons may so sell, but not to be taken away.

Violations of this section are punished by fine of $100 to $500 and at the discretion of the Court imprisonment not exceeding 12 months.

Nothing herein prevents wholesale confectioners from selling fruits preserved in ardent spirits. (Laws, 1883–4, p. 604, § 1.)

Applications to sell by retail or keep a barroom shall be made to the Commissioner of Revenue for the city or county, who shall give the applicant a certificate of the same, and he shall deposit the amount with the Treasurer and may then present such certificate with the receipt of the Treasurer indorsed thereon to the Judge of the county or corporation, who shall hear evidence for and against granting the license and determine. Anyone may have himself entered a defendant and contest the license. If the Judge is satisfied the applicant is a fit person and has a suitable place, he may grant the license upon bond given in $250 to $500 to abide by the law, and thereupon the Commissioner of Revenue shall issue the license. Either party may appeal to the Judge of the Circuit Court. After license is granted the Commissioner shall make return thereof to the Treasurer of the city or county and to the Auditor of Public Accounts. The Treasurer shall pay the amount over to said Auditor within 20 days, to the credit of the State. If the application is finally refused the deposit shall be refunded. (Id., § 2.) The amount of tax for selling at wholesale is $350, or if malt liquors only are sold, $150. The person desiring this license will pay the amount to the City or County Treasurer and take his receipt, upon presentation of which to the Commissioner of Revenue license shall be issued. (Id., § 3.) The sum to be paid for retail license shall be $75 in places of 1,000 inhabitants or less, and $175 in larger places; but if licensee sells under retail or barroom license, malt liquors only, in places of less than 5,000 inhabitants, $30. (Id., § 4.) For keeping a barroom shall be paid $75 in places of under 1,000 inhabitants and $125 in larger ones, and 15 per cent. of the rental value of the places in each case. (Id., § 5.) For keeping an ordinary for selling liquor to be drunk on the premises only, $75 in places of less than 2,000 inhabitants and $125 in places larger, and in addition in both cases 8, 5 and 3 per cent. of the rental value of the house and furniture, according as that value is less than $1,000 or $2,000 or more than $2,000. (Id., §§ 6, 7.) Any licensed wholesale dealer may obtain a retail license for half the regular fee, provided he comply with the requirements to obtain it. So a retail dealer may have a barroom license at half price, and a barroom or ordinary licensee may have a retail license at half price in addition to the first license. (Id., § 8.) The amount to be paid by each keeper of a malt liquor-saloon shall be $40 in places of 1,000 inhabitants or less, and $60 in larger places. (Id., § 9.) The bond under § 2 above shall be deemed forfeited for failure to pay the license fee required, and at the discretion of the Court the license will be forfeited. (Id., § 10.) The amounts herein required are in lieu of taxes upon the capital employed. (Id., § 11.) Rectifiers shall pay $150, but manufacturers may rectify their own product without additional license. (Id., § 12.) Druggists desiring to sell liquor shall take out retail dealers' licenses, but this does not apply to liquor used in preparation of medicines, although it does apply to alcoholic bitters. (Id., § 13.) Manufacturers or distillers who distil 10 bushels or less per day shall pay $30 up to $500; up to 300 bushels per day at the rate of $200 for each additional 100 bushels mashed a day; and they may sell at wholesale at the manufactory. Distillers of brandy from pomace or from cider or fruits, up to 40 gallons, are not required to pay anything. Those distilling more than 40 gallons, if they run their distilleries less than three months, must pay $10; if they run less than six months, $20; more than six months, $50. Manufacturers of malt liquor shall pay $50. Any resident manufacturer of wine may sell his wine in quantities not less than one gallon without license. (Id., § 14.)

The license shall be conspicuously posted in the place licensed, on penalty of not exceeding $100. (Id., § 15.)

This law shall be given in charge to the Grand Jury at each term. (Id., § 16.)

In order to sell liquor upon water-craft, except steamships plying the Atlantic Ocean, licenses must be obtained, but at the lowest rates provided herein. (Id., § 16.)

Violations of this law, except as otherwise provided for, shall be punished by fine of $50 to $100. (Id., § 21.)

Manufacturers, like wholesalers, are licensed by the Commissioners of Revenue upon receipt by the Treasurer. (See Code, 1887, §§ 533–566.)

Whenever one-fourth of the number voting at the previous November election in any magisterial district of a county or in any such district or in a city petition for a special election therein on the question of licenses, the Judge of the county or corporation shall within 10 days order such election to be held, and notices thereof shall be posted in every voting precinct. No other such election shall be held there for two years. (Code, 1887, § 581.) Notwithstanding the election is held for the whole county, the vote shall be by districts, and if against license in any district no license shall be issued there, and if for license, the contrary. (Id., § 584.) Any town constituting a separate election district may in the same manner procure an election. (Id., § 585.) No election hereunder shall be within 30 days of any county, corporation, State or national election. (Id., § 586.) Selling in districts voting no-license is punished as selling without license. But this does not apply to manufacturers. (Id., § 587.)

A liquor license may be revoked by the Court giving it. (Id., § 560.)

Getting drunk is fined $1. (Id., § 3798.)

Opening a saloon or selling liquor therein on Sunday is fined $10 to $500, with forfeiture of license; but this does not apply to cities having police regulations providing equal penalties. (Id., § 3804.)

Selling liquor within three miles of any campmeeting or other place of worship during service is fined $10 to $20; for second offense, the same fine and added imprisonment 10 to 30 days (Id., § 3807), with forfeiture of liquor and vessels and structure containing it (Id., § 3808); but this doesn't apply to licensed dealers. (Id., § 3809.)

Selling knowingly to minors without written authority of parent is fined $10 to $200. (Id., § 3828.)

Barrooms shall be closed election day from sunset before to sunrise after the election. During that time no person shall dispose of liquors, upon penalty of not exceeding $1,000 and imprisonment not over one year. (Id., §§ 3846–7.) Officers shall arrest persons committing or suspected of intending to commit such offenses, and hold them for examination. (Id., § 3848.)

If any Justice suspect any person of unlawfully selling liquor he shall summon the person and witnesses to appear before him, and upon finding sufficient cause he shall cause the State's Attorney to institute proceedings and shall bind the offender to be of good behavior for one year. (Id., § 3921.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by majority vote of all the members of each House; to be concurred in by a majority of each House in the next Legislature; upon submission to the people a majority carries it.

Washington.

Early Provisions.—The first Legislature prohibited retailing of intoxicating liquor without license from the County Commissioners, upon penalty of $50. It prescribed a license fee to be fixed at the discretion of the Commissioners. (Laws, 1854, p. 339.)

In 1855 selling liquor to Indians was prohibited under penalty of $25 to $500, and on Sunday on pain of a fine of $75. (Laws, 1855, pp. 30–1.) The same year, on p. 26 of the Laws, was submitted a short act prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquor, except by Agents appointed to sell for medicinal, mechanical or sacramental purposes.

A License Fee of $300 (1857).—In 1857 (Laws, p. 31), applicants for license were required to present petitions signed by a majority of the adult white male inhabitants of the precinct and to pay $300 license fee.

Selling to minors after being requested not to do so by parents or guardians was punished by fine not over $1,000 and imprisonment not exceeding six months, with revocation of license. (Laws of 1859, p. 128.) And to prevent the sale of adulterated liquor, inspection was provided for by Laws of 1859, p. 332, and the selling of such liquor was punished by imprisonment not more than six months and fine of not over $500. (Id.)

In 1871 the County Commissioners were authorized to grant licenses in places where there was little business for less than $300 and not less than $100. And the penalty for selling without license was made $50 to $500 and imprisonment 10 to 90 days. (Laws, 1871, p. 58.)

For a few counties the license law was relaxed and the same law was also somewhat fortified by scattered prohibitions of sales on election days and to drunkards.

In 1885 (Laws, p. 31) was enacted a general Local Option law, applicable to election precincts, upon petition of 15 voters thereof. This law was declared unconstitutional because such precincts were municipal corporations, to which such power could be delegated.

Submission of Constitutional Prohibition (1889).—A separate article prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquor was submitted for adoption with the State Constitution, but not adopted.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—The Board of County Commissioners shall have the sole and exclusive authority and power to regulate, restrain, license or prohibit the sale of liquor in counties outside of incorporated places, licenses in no case to be granted for less than $300 or more than $1,000, 10 per cent. to go to the State, 35 per cent. to the county school fund and 55 per cent. to the county general fund. No license to be granted within one mile of the limits of any incorporated place. (Laws, 1887–8, p. 124, § 1.) The governing bodies of cities, towns and villages incorporated have authority to grant licenses within the limits of such places, and if they grant licenses the same shall be for the above amounts, to be divided as above, except that no school fund is mentioned. (Id., § 2.) In granting the license authorized, the proper authorities shall exact of the applicant a bond in $1,000 to keep an orderly house and not sell to minors. In case of violating the terms of license he shall forfeit it and be subject to the penalties for illegal selling. The authorities granting a license have full power to declare it forfeited for such violations. (Id., § 3.) Any person selling liquor without license shall be fined not exceeding $1,000 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both. (Id., § 4.) Nothing herein allows anyone to dispose of liquor without license, except by the next section. (Id., § 5.) This act does not apply to druggists who may dispense liquors upon physicians' prescriptions or may sell pure alcohol for scientific or mechanical purposes upon the written certificate of any reputable mechanic or scientist that he wants it for specified purposes and no others; and they may sell pure grape wine to any church officers upon certificate that it is to be used for sacramental purposes. (Id., § 6.) Any druggist selling otherwise is liable as for selling without license. (Id., § 7.)

There is a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the common schools. (Laws, 1889-90, p. 372, § 45.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by a two-thirds vote of all the members of the two Houses, at one session; popular vote to be taken at the next general election for Representatives, three months' notice to be given. A majority vote carries it.

West Virginia.

Early Provisions.—The first Legislature of the State enacted a license law punishing sales of liquor without license by fine of $10 to $100. The license fee was determined by the yearly value of the premises upon which the business was conducted. The tax on licenses was placed in classes, amounting practically to 5 per cent. of the rental value aforesaid, no license being less than $5. (Laws, 1863, cc. 113, 123.) This is the basis of the law as it now stands. The civil damage and nuisance provisions were enacted in 1872, and the High License ones in 1885 and 1887. The form of the law is that of a tax law, all taxes being now imposed in the same chapter.

Submission of Constitutional Prohibition (1888).—A Prohibitory Constitutional Amendment was submitted to the people in 1888 by Laws of 1887, pp. 230, 179, and defeated.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—Laws may be passed regulating or prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors within the State. (Const., art. 6, § 46.)

No person without a State license shall keep a hotel, eating-house or restaurant, or furnish intoxicating drinks at a theatre, or sell or keep for sale spirituous liquors, wine, porter, ale or beer. All mixtures, preparations or liquids that will produce intoxication, whether patented or not, shall be deemed spirituous liquors. (Laws, 1889, c. 29, § 1, amending Code, 1887, cc. 32 and 33. Violations hereof, except where otherwise provided, are punished by fine of $10 to $100, and at discretion, by imprisonment not exceeding three months. (Laws, 1889, c. 29, § 3.) This does not require a license to sell malt liquors in addition to one to sell spirituous, nor prohibit a druggist without license from selling spirituous liquor and wine for medicinal purposes or alcohol for medicinal, scientific or mechanical purposes. (Id., § 4.) If a druggist sell such liquor otherwise, he shall be fined $10 to $100; and if any person not a druggist sell liquor without license upon or along any of the boundary rivers of the State, he shall be fined as above and imprisoned 30 to 60 days. (Id., § 5.) In any prosecution against a druggist, if the sale is proven, it is presumed unlawful sale without contrary proof. No sale by a druggist, except of alcohol for mechanical or scientific purposes, shall be made except upon prescription in writing of a physician in good standing and not of intemperate habits, specifying the name of the person and the liquor to be supplied him, and that the same is absolutely necessary as a medicine for such person, and is not to be used as a beverage. Not more than one sale shall be made on a prescription. The production of such a prescription rebuts the presumption arising from proof of sale, if the jury believe the sale was made in good faith, believing the prescription true. (Id., § 7.) If a physician give such a prescription falsely, he shall be fined $50 to $200. Every prescription shall be filed and be subject to the inspection of the Prosecuting Attorney, any Grand Juror and any relative of any person sold to, on penalty of $10 to $100. (Id., § 7.)

A hotel or tavern license shall always be revoked if it appear that the principal object in obtaining the same was not to provide lodgings and diet for travellers, but to facilitate selling liquor. (Id.,§ 8.) Hotel licenses are taxed according to the yearly rental value of the premises occupied. (Id., § 9.)

State licenses shall be issued only when authorized by the County Court, or within an incorporated place only as authorized by the Council thereof under the charter; provided that no license to sell liquor shall be issued for a place within two miles of such an incorporated place in which there is no license, without consent of the Council thereof. (Id., § 10.) Persons desiring licenses shall apply for certificates to the Assessor of the proper district, and if the business is to be in an incorporated place a resolution of the Council authorizing the license must be delivered to the Assessor; if not in an incorporated place a copy of such an order from the County Court must be delivered. The Assessor shall thereupon deliver the applicant a certificate of the license, and the amount to be paid, which certificate, with the receipt of the proper officer for the State tax written thereon, shall be sufficient license. (Id., § 11.) An Assessor may obtain a license in the same way from the Clerk of the County Court. (Id., § 12.) Where the Council of a city, village or town is authorized by charter to forbid the liquor business, a State license will not authorize a person to engage in it. (Id., § 13.) Neither the County Court nor municipal authorities may grant a license without being satisfied the licensee is not of intemperate habits. (Id., § 14.)

If any person having a State license to sell liquor sells to any minor, person of unsound mind or one intoxicated or in the habit of becoming so, or permits any such persons to drink to intoxication on his premises, or sells on Sunday, he shall be fined $20 to $100. (Id., § 16.) A sale of such liquors by one person for another is a sale by both, and both may be indicted jointly or separately. (Id., § 17.)

All houses or places where liquors are sold illegally are public nuisances and may be abated upon conviction of the owner, and any Court of Equity may by injunction restrain or abate the same upon bill filed by any citizen. (Id., § 18.) The owner of such house or place who sells or permits knowingly any liquor to be sold therein unlawfully, may be indicted for keeping a nuisance, and upon conviction he shall be fined $20 to $100 and at discretion imprisoned 10 to 30 days, and judgment shall be given that the place be abated and closed. (Id., § 19.)

Every husband, wife, child, parent, guardian, employer or any other person injured in person or property or means of support by any intoxicated person or in consequence of the intoxication of any person, shall have a right of action againt the person or persons selling the liquor that caused intoxication and the owner of the premises on which liquor was sold to his knowledge. The unlawful sale of liquor on leased premises forfeits the lease. Landlords have their action against tenants for all losses under this section. (Id., § 20.)

If the sale of liquor is carried on in such manner that the person so selling cannot be identified, the officer charged with the execution of a warrant under the 23d section may break open the place to arrest or identify the person. (Id., § 21.)

No license shall issue to sell liquor without bond in $3,500 to obey the law and pay all damages and costs recovered against the licensee under this chapter, until the penalty of the bond is exhausted. (Id., § 22.)

Every Justice of the Peace, upon information under oath that liquors are unlawfully sold in any named place, shall issue his warrant requiring the person suspected to be brought before him for examination, or the place to be searched and the parties found therein to be so brought before him, and requiring that the witnesses named be summoned; and if there is probable cause, the accused and the material witnesses shall be bound over to the next Circuit Court, and the accused be bound not to break the law in the meantime. (Id., § 23.)

The licensing authority, for good cause shown, may revoke a license upon petition in writing of any inhabitant, given upon reasonable notice to and in the hearing of the accused. (Id., § 24.)

Every license shall specify the place of business, and business may be conducted at no other place. (Id., § 25.) The licensing authority may authorize the transfer of license to another place by endorsement thereon. (Id., § 26.) No person may assign his license to another without assent of the licensing authority and a new bond by the transferee. (Id., § 27.) Each license shall expire April 30, and if granted for less than a year the tax shall be proportionate to the time it has to run. (Id., § 29.) Every person claiming to hold a State license shall produce the same for inspection whenever required to do so by the Prosecuting Attorney, Sheriff, Justice, Collector or Assessor, upon penalty of $10. (Id., § 33.)

Every hotel, eating-house or restaurant shall pay 3 per cent. of the yearly value of the premises. (Id., § 53.) Distillers and brewers shall pay $125 to $550 according to volume of product. (Id., §§ 54–59.) Licenses to sell liquor at theatre cost $150 (Id., § 60); licenses to retail all liquors, $350 (Id., § 61); licenses to wholesale all liquors, $350, in addition to all other taxes. (Id., § 62.) These State license rates may be increased at the pleasure of cities, towns or villages, which are empowered to impose taxes in every case in which a State license is required. (Code, 1887, c. 47, § 33; passed 1882, c. 92.)

No retailer shall sell more than five gallons at a time (Id., § 63), and no wholesaler shall sell less. (Id., § 64.)

Apple and peach brandy distilled in the State from fruit grown therein may be sold by the distiller in quantities of five gallons or over by paying a license tax of $100. (Id., § 65.) Licenses to sell at retail domestic wines, ale, beer and drinks of like nature only cost $100. (Id., § 66.)

Treating with liquor on election day is fined

$10 to $50, and if by a candidate he forfeits office if elected. (Code, 1887, c. 5, § 10.) Liquor places shall be closed and no one shall sell liquor on election day, upon penalty of $50 to $100. (Id., § 11.) If any person be drunk at or near an election place, he shall be fined $10 to $50 and shall give security for his good behavior six months, or be imprisoned five to 20 days. (Id., § 12.) Selling liquor within two miles of a camp-meeting or within half a mile of any other religious meeting, except by persons engaged in regular business, is fined $10 to $50. (Id., c. 149, §§ 20, 21.)

If any person get drunk he shall be fined $1. (Id., § 15.)

The nature of alcoholic drinks and narcotics, and their effects upon the human system in connection with physiology and hygiene, shall be taught in the common schools, and no certificate shall be granted to any teacher not qualified. (Laws, 1889, c. 3.)

Wisconsin.

Early Provisions.—By the laws of 1838, p. 384 (republished in 1867), there was laid on tavern license a tax of $5 to $50, and on retailing liquors a tax not less than $100; and it seems that the County Commissioners might grant licenses, but there were no rules in the matter.

By Laws of 1850, c. 139, no person was allowed to retail liquor until he had executed a bond in $1,000 to pay all damages that the community or individuals might sustain by reason of his vending liquors, to support all paupers, widows and orphans made or helped to be made by said traffic, and to pay the expenses of all prosecutions growing out of or justly attributable to his selling. Married women might sue in their own names for damages to themselves and children. No suit could be maintained for bills for liquor sold at retail, or on notes or evidences of debt for the same. On trial of a suit hereunder for anything growing out of intoxication it was necessary only to prove that defendant had sold or given liquor that day or the day before to the person intoxicated. The authorities of a county or place where any habitual drunkard was a public charge might sue anyone who had been in the habit of selling such person liquor within six months. Any liquor-dealers against whom judgments were obtained hereunder might compel contributions from all dealers who had sold liquors to the person in question. Those selling liquor without giving bonds were fined $50 to $500 and imprisoned 10 days to six months. All charter powers to grant license were repealed, as well as the chapter of the laws providing therefor.

This law was repealed by Laws of 1851, c. 162, which gave County Supervisors and municipal authorities the right to grant license for $100 upon bond in $500 to keep an orderly house and obey the law. The penalty for selling without license was $100. Any member of a Municipal Board might notify all licensed persons not to sell to spendthrifts who were excessive drinkers, or to habitual drunkards.

In 1853 (Laws, c. 101) the question of a Prohibitory liquor law was submitted to the people. A draft of such law was not proposed, and no such law was enacted.

In 1859 selling liquor on Sunday and election day was prohibited by fine of not exceeding $5. (Laws, 1859, c. 115.)

It was provided by Laws of 1862, c. 275, that an Indian found drunk should be held until he informed against the seller.

Selling to minors was fined $20 to $100 by laws of 1866, c. 36.

Liquor-sellers were disqualified to be Justices of the Peace by Laws of 1867, c. 105.

Making or selling adulterated liquor was punished by fine of $100 or imprisonment one year, or both. (Laws, 1867, c. 162.)

In 1872 a short license law, with civil damage provisions, made the penalty for selling unlawfully $50 to $100 and imprisonment 20 to 50 days. (Laws, 1872, c. 127.)

The liquor laws were codified by the act of 1874, c. 179. The penalty, however, was reduced to a fine of $10 to $40 or imprisonment 20 to 60 days. This law remains the basis of the law as it now stands though acts of 1885, 1887 and 1889 have much amplified many sections.

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—The Town Boards, Village Boards and Common Councils of the respective towns, villages and cities may grant licenses under this chapter to sell liquor in quantities less than one gallon (to be drunk on the premises), on payment of $100 in a town having within its boundaries no village with a population of 500 or more; in other towns $200, and for such license to sell liquor not to be drunk on the premises (except for pharmacists), $200.

Application for license shall state the kind of license wanted and give a designation of the premises. Such licenses shall be in force until the first Tuesday in May unless sooner revoked by the licensing authority. The above-mentioned bodies shall meet on the third Tuesday of April to act upon such application. (R. S., 1889, § 1548.) The said Boards may grant to any registered pharmacist a permit to retail liquors for medicinal, mechanical or scientific purposes only (not to be drunk on the premises) for $10. Such pharmacist shall keep a book in which to enter the details of every sale, which book shall be open to the inspection of the Board, and a copy thereof must be filed with the Municipal Clerk each third Tuesday in April. (Id., § 1548*a*.)

On applications of 12 citizens to the Municipal Clerk, he shall order an election for the third Tuesday in September to ascertain whether licenses shall be raised from $100 to $250 or $400, or from $200 to $350 or $500 respectively, the ballots to be: "To be paid for license, $——." The sum favored by the highest number of voters shall be the sum to be required the next license year. (Id., § 1548*b*.) That sum shall remain fixed until the next election. (Id., § 1548*c*.)

Every applicant for license shall file a bond in $500 to keep an orderly house, allow no gaming, not sell to a minor except upon order of parent or guardian, or to persons intoxicated, or to habitual drunkards, to observe the law and to pay damages recovered under

§ 1560. (Id., § 1549.) Any person selling without license or permit shall be fined $50 to $100 or be imprisoned three to six months, and on second conviction shall be punished by both fine and imprisonment. (Id., § 1550.)

Any person making a false statement to a pharmacist to obtain liquor, or any such pharmacist not complying with this chapter, shall be fined $10 to $40, and on second conviction $40 to $100 or be imprisoned 30 days to three months. (Id., § 1550*a.*)

Upon complaint to any Justice of the Peace by any person that he has reason to believe any offense has been committed against this law, the Justice shall issue a warrant to arrest the accused and summon witnesses to appear at the trial. (Id., § 1551.) The District Attorney on notice shall appear and prosecute. (Id., § 1552.) Every Supervisor, Trustee, Alderman, Justice or police officer who shall know of an offense shall make complaint against the offender, upon penalty of $25. (Id., § 1553.)

If any person by excessive drinking misspends or wastes his estate or injures his health or safety or that of his family, his wife, the Supervisor, Aldermen, Trustees, or County Superintendent of the Poor may in writing forbid all licensed persons selling to him for a year; and similar notice not to sell to any habitual drunkard may be given by the above-named persons, except the first and last. (Id., § 1554.) Such authorities may renew such prohibition at the end of the year, and those disregarding any such prohibition shall be fined $50. (Id., §§ 1555, 1556.) The person to whom such sales have been prohibited may be arrested on complaint of above officers and brought before a Justice to testify from whom and how he obtained liquor, and he may be committed until he so testifies. It shall not be necessary to allege any facts showing that the person to whom the liquor was sold was one to whom sales might be forbidden. (Id., § 1556.) Any person selling or dealing in liquor in evasion of the law, or selling to minors or intoxicated persons, or selling within one mile of an insane hospital, is guilty of a misdemeanor. (Id., § 1557.)

Upon complaint of any resident that any licensed person violates the law, the proper Board shall issue a summons to such accused person to appear some day within 10 days to show cause why his license shall not be revoked. (Id., § 1558.) If the accused do not appear he shall be considered guilty, or if found guilty on hearing, his license shall be revoked and he be disqualified for license one year. (Id., § 1559.) On certiorari of such revocation to the Circuit Court or on appeal from such Court, there shall be no suspension of the order of revocation during pendency. But in any such case on 10 days' notice to the other party, the licensee may have the Circuit Court hear the matter at any Court in its circuit, or have a Judge hear the same at chambers. (Id., § 1559*a.*)

Any person injured in person, property or means of support in consequence of the intoxication of a minor or habitual drunkard, shall have an action for all damages against any person who has been notified by the municipal authorities or by the husband, wife, parent, relative, guardians or persons in care of such minor or habitual drunkard not to sell to him. (Id., § 1560.)

Any person found in a public place drunk so as to disturb others or not to be able to care for himself, shall be fined not exceeding $10 or be imprisoned not more than five days; but cities and villages may provide a different punishment. (Id., § 1561.)

Moneys derived from licenses shall go to the support of the poor. (Id., § 1562.) In any action by any town against a village for license moneys, it is sufficient defense that the village has spent the money for support of the poor. (Id., § 1562*a.*)

All places where liquor is sold unlawfully are nuisances and on conviction of the keeper shall be shut up and abated. (Id., § 1563.)

Nothing herein shall permit any city or village to reduce the license fees below the statutory limit. (Id., § 1563*a.*)

If anyone sell liquor on Sunday or election day, he shall be fined $5 to $25 or imprisoned not exceeding 30 days, or both. (Id., § 1564.)

Giving away liquor, or any other device to evade the law, is unlawful selling. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor under this chapter, not otherwise provided for, shall be fined $50. In any prosecution hereunder it is not necessary to state the kind or quantity of liquor sold, or the person to whom sold. (Id., § 1565.)

Whenever 10 per cent. of the voters in any municipality at the last general election for Governor present to the Clerk a petition praying therefor, said Clerk shall order an election on the first Tuesday of April next to submit the question of license. Notice shall be given as for judicial elections, and the result shall stand until another election. (Id., § 1565*a.*) The ballot shall be "For License" or "Against License," and no license shall be granted in that municipality contrary to the vote, but in no case shall license be granted to a keeper of a house of ill-fame. (Id., § 1565*bc.*) The election shall be held and votes canvassed as provided for by the general election law, and result shall be certified and entered upon the books of the town, village or city as required by law. (Id., § 1565*d.*) If after vote against license anyone shall deal in liquor in such place, he shall be fined $50 to $100 or be imprisoned three to six months, and for second conviction both. (Id., § 1565*e.*)

Nothing in this act shall affect the sale of liquor for the above-excepted purposes by pharmacists. (Id., § 1565*f.*)

Selling liquor to Indians is forbidden by §§ 1566–9.

No election shall be held in a liquor-selling place or place adjoining thereto. (Id., § 15*a.*)

Any jailer or person who shall give a prisoner liquor, except upon the certificate of a physician, or who shall have liquor in a prison for such purpose, shall be fined not exceeding $100. (Id., § 4497.)

Selling liquor within two miles of any camp or other religious meeting (except at a regularly licensed place), without permission, is fined $5 to $50, and the liquor is forfeited. (Id., § 4598.)

Adulterating liquor is fined not exceeding

$100 or punished by imprisonment not exceeding six months, and the liquor is forfeited. (Id., § 4600.)

No Justice's Court shall be held in a saloon, upon penalty of $25. (Id., § 3570.)

Claims for liquor are not allowed in the Probate Court. (Id., § 3841.)

There is a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools. (R. S., 1889, § 447*a*, passed 1885, Laws, c. 327.)

An Amendment to the Constitution may be proposed by majority vote of the two Houses; to be concurred in by a majority of each House in the next Legislature. A majority vote of the people carries it.

Wyoming.

The first session of the Legislature, in 1869 (Laws, c. 18), regulated licenses in the same form as now, but the license fee required was $100, or $50 at any point 10 miles from any city, town or railway station; and selling unlawfully was punished by a fine of double the amount of license and imprisonment for three months (half to the informer).

The Law as It Existed in 1889.—Licenses shall be furnished and the moneys for the same collected by the Sheriff, who shall not knowingly permit any one to transact any business requiring license without one. (R. S., 1887, § 1433.)

No one shall sell spirituous, malt or fermented liquors, or wines in less quantities than five gallons without license, upon penalty of $150 (half to the informer). All persons engaged in selling liquor by the barrel, case or original package, and selling in quantities not less than five gallons, shall pay a license fee of $175. This does not apply to the manufacture of ale and beer or to the sale at the manufactory in quantities of one keg or upwards. (Id., § 1442.) Such license shall not authorize sales in more than one place, except upon license for all such places. (Id., § 1443.)

Whenever any person with a retail liquor license permits any disorder, drunkenness or unlawful games or violations of law in his place, he shall forfeit his license, which cannot be renewed for three months. (Id., § 1444.)

Retail liquor licenses shall pay, at or within five miles of any railway station, or town, city, village or place within five miles of a railway, $300; in other places, $100. (Id., § 1453.)

Any person selling liquor without license shall be fined not exceeding $1,000 or imprisoned not exceeding six months, or both. (Id., § 1455.)

Keeping a liquor place open or selling liquor on Sunday or election day shall be punished by fine of $25 to $100, or imprisonment not exceeding three months, or both. (Id., § 1034; amended by Laws of 1888, c. 86.)

Liquors shall not be sold in any jail, or conveyed to any person confined therein, or furnished to any prisoner, except upon prescription of a physician. (R. S., 1887, § 1373.)

[The law above summarized was the Territorial law, as it existed at the time [1890] of the admission of Wyoming into the Union.]

Wilbur Aldrich.

License.—License always implies the legalization of a portion of the liquor traffic.[1] It aims also to repress a portion of that traffic. It contains thus both a sanction and a condemnation of the saloon. It is a statutory authorization of a part of the traffic. It is also in theory a statutory limitation of another part of the traffic. It is this double character of license which causes, even among intelligent voters, so much confusion of thought concerning it. But it is highly important to emphasize the fact that license represses one portion of the traffic only at the expense of sanctioning another portion of it.

This simple analysis of the definition of license answers most of the arguments in defense of it. The question is asked whether 10 saloons are not better than 15. The reply is that they are not if the 15 can be reduced to 10 only by definitely giving the sanction of Government to the 10. Are not 10 murders better than 20? No, if the 20 can be reduced to 10 only by a statutory authorization of the 10. Is not half a loaf better than no bread? No, if the half-loaf can be had only on condition that it be first saturated with poison, and this by the authority of the whole community. Did not Moses license polygamy and so attempt to limit its range? Yes, but not at the expense of assuming that the divine sanction was given to polygamy within the actual range to which it was limited. Of two evils must we not choose the less? No, if in choosing the less we are required to do evil ourselves. Of two evils choose neither.

License makes the community itself a rumseller. It has now become disreputable for the individual to be a rumseller. Comparatively few native Americans engage in the retail liquor traffic. The foremost Christian denominations, such as the Methodist and Presbyterian, exclude liquor-sellers from church membership. But license, high or low, makes the State a liquor-seller. As Horace Greeley was accustomed to say, it is disreputable enough for the individual, under the pressure of personal wants, to become a liquor-seller; but for the whole State to become such and this with no necessity, but from pure greed and cowardice, is infamous.

---

[1] Bouvier, in his Law Dictionary, defines license as "a right given by some competent authority to do an act which without such authority would be illegal." The text of the document giving a license usually reads: "License is hereby given by authority of the city of —— to A. B. to keep a saloon and to sell," etc. All this shows that license means legalization of a portion of the liquor traffic. A tax, on the contrary, confers no authority on him who pays it. Bouvier defines a tax as "a contribution imposed by Government on individuals for the service of the State." It is futile, therefore, to contend that license is simply a tax upon the traffic and only a limitation of it and not an authorization of a portion of it.

The actual saloon of our day is notoriously a school of crime, an ally of anarchy, a fountain of social misery, a source of heavy taxation, a cesspool of political corruption. License makes the whole community a partner in the business of the actual saloon. To that business, with these results, license gives governmental sanction, and so a legal respectability. But the actual saloon in most cases has infamous allies. The gambling-hell and the brothel and the gilded High License saloon usually go together in great cities. As Prof. Herrick Johnson has said in an epigram not soon to be forgotten: "Low license asks for your son; High License for your daughter also." High License tempts the saloon to make alliance with the gambling-hell and the brothel so as to raise funds to pay the High License fees. This temptation is rarely resisted. License of the saloon, therefore, may easily amount in effect to a license of gambling and harlotry. It is assumed in this discussion that the wickedness of licensing these allies of the saloon is admitted. But the community that fosters the liquor traffic by giving it legalization does practically make itself largely responsible for the usual allies of the traffic.

Liquor-selling, it is sometimes said, is not a sin in itself. But the business of the actual saloon is what is in question. We think that this is a sin in itself, fully justifying the exclusion of the liquor-seller from church membership, as it now does in the leading evangelical denominations. But certainly the business, even if it were not a sin in itself, is a sin in its circumstances. The wickedness of all forms of license is proved by the wickedness notoriously resulting from the business of the actual saloon of our day. To make the community a partner in that business and its results by license, high or low, is not only the worst social economy but also ethical wickedness. The actual liquor traffic, as the Methodist Church officially declares, "can never be legalized without sin." It may not be a sin in itself to light a match, but it is a sin in its circumstances to light a match carelessly in a powder magazine. The actual saloon manufactures paupers, criminals, widows, orphans, madmen and lost souls, and license of the actual saloon makes the community itself a participator in this wickedness.

License proceeds upon self-contradictory principles. It sanctions the traffic with one hand and condemns it with the other. In the days of the American conflict with slavery, Government treated slave-holding as a crime north of Mason and Dixon's line. All the power of the Government was to be brought to bear against it there. One hair's-breadth south of that line, however, slavery changed its character and was to be permitted. All the powers of the Government were to be exercised to defend it there. History has now proved that a policy thus divided against itself could not prosper. Under a license system Government treats the liquor traffic as it once did slavery. The license fee is Mason and Dixon's line. On one side of that line Government condemns the traffic. A hair's-breadth across the line, on the other side, Government defends it. These principles are self-contradictory. A house divided against itself cannot stand.

License forces the saloon into politics, disciplines the enemy and so is the source of untold political corruption. The licensed liquor traffic corrupts the police force and the lower Courts and is the chief source of municipal misrule, which is the principal peril of free institutions.

License apparently brings a revenue to the State and so entrenches the traffic behind the cupidity of short-sighted taxpayers. It is true that it robs Peter to pay Paul, but it does not pay Paul. The expenses which the traffic brings upon the community greatly exceed any profit arising from license fees. But this fact is overlooked by average voters. The money there appears to be in license is a temptation to the State and a chief source of the political power of the saloon.

License does not for any length of time diminish the amount of sales of liquor, although for a while it may diminish the number of places in which liquor is sold. But the large establishments often own the small ones and foster the illegal trade of the latter. The gilded saloons want the low dives kept open to receive the refuse constituency of the former. When the drunkard becomes a noisy and loathsome sot he is turned out of this upper into the lower grade of saloons.

License gives the traffic legal, industrial, political and social respectability and so increases the power of the saloon to tempt the respectable classes and lowers and corrupts the temperance sentiment of the community at large. The city Government of Omaha, under High License of the saloons, has sunk to so low a level that it now derives a large revenue from arrangements nearly approaching the licensing of houses of unreportable infamy.

License prohibits Prohibition, for it always provides for the continuance of the traffic. The revenue which the misled voter suffers the State to obtain from High License, although it by no means covers the damages inflicted by the traffic and is collected from the victims of the saloons and their families, operates as a golden bar to Prohibition. The higher the license fee the higher and stronger is this bar. It is notorious that the policy of license is favored by politicians as a means of defeating Prohibition. The Chicago *Tribune* very justly says: "High License, reasonably and properly enforced, is the only barrier against Prohibition in the present temper of the people in almost every State of the Union." In January, 1889, the Omaha *Bee* said: "The only effective way to block Prohibition is to enforce rigidly High License."

License is generally approved by the liquor traffic itself.

License, so far as it produces apparently good results, owes its seeming success to its restrictive features. The Brooks law in Pennsylvania, for example, transferred the power to grant licenses in Philadelphia and Allegheny from corrupt political Boards to the Judges of reputable Courts. The Judges granted licenses much more cautiously than the politicians had done, and gave full force to the prohibitive elements of the law.

License has been weighed in the scales of practical experience for hundreds of years and found wanting. The present power of the liquor traffic and the current intemperance of our time have grown up under it. Over against this indisputable fact is to be placed the fact which is equally indisputable, that no-license and Prohibition, whenever fairly weighed in the balances, have been most significantly approved by their practical results.

License is condemned as wickedness by the chief Christian denominations of our time. The celebrated declaration of the Methodist Church in its General Conference of 1888 may now fairly be said to represent the opinion of the most enlightened and religiously earnest portions of Christendom at large, so that in citing it here we summarize scores of equivalent declarations from other religious bodies: "The liquor traffic can never be legalized without sin. License, high or low, is vicious in principle and powerless as a remedy." It is gross inconsistency for church members to vote for license and then exclude licensed rumsellers from church membership.

JOSEPH COOK.

[For the provisions of various license acts, see LEGISLATION. For comparative results under license and Prohibition, see HIGH LICENSE and PROHIBITION, BENEFITS OF.]

Light Liquors.—A term applied, in general, to all the fermented beverages, and particularly to the weaker ones. Practically all the ordinary beers, wines and ciders consumed by the common people in the United States, varying in alcoholic strength from 3 to 15 or 18 per cent., are regarded as "light liquors."

Since the use of distilled spirits became widespread, there has been a disposition among many persons to look upon these milder beverages as relatively less harmful, and to discriminate in favor of them and even encourage their consumption by precept and legislation. In the American colonial period the dangers of whiskey, gin and rum were clearly recognized, and numerous statutes were enacted restricting or prohibiting their sale to Indians and others. Although it sometimes happened that these statutes applied nominally or indirectly to beer and wine also, there seems to have been little perception of the evils of the lighter drinks. The Prohibitory law of Oglethorpe in Georgia (1733–42) was directed against distilled liquors entirely; and under this philanthropic measure the beer and wine traffic was actually favored. At the outset of the temperance reform there were a few far-seeing men who understood that ultimately no exceptions in behalf of particular alcoholic beverages could be made consistently; but spirits were first attacked, and in most of the earliest temperance societies the members were under no obligation to abstain from beer and wine. The history of the movement in the British Isles shows that a similar tendency prevailed there; even the expediency and value of Father Mathew's total abstinence work were questioned by many who had been engaged for years in efforts to reclaim drunkards, and who sincerely believed that indiscriminate warfare against all kinds of liquors would be injudicious if not illogical. (See EDGAR, JOHN.) In nearly all the countries of Continental Europe, where the temperance agitation is still in its primitive stages, opposition to malt and vinous drinks seems not to be suggested or contemplated, even by the men specially anxious for reform; although where Good Templar and other radical organizations have been introduced (notably in the Scandinavian nations) there is a growing sentiment against every species of intoxicants.

This preference for beer and wine is one of the manifestations of the "moderation" theory. Conservative persons hesitate to sweep away the institutions and customs of ages, yet perceiving the necessity of improvement seek refuge in alluring compromises. Their general acceptance of the "light liquors" argument has given to the liquor legislation of the 19th Century one of its most striking features. Discriminations in favor of the manufacturers and sellers of beer, wine and cider have been provided for in most of the license laws of the United States, and have been inserted in a number of Prohibitory statutes. The scope and effectiveness of Prohibition in Michigan, Iowa, Massachusetts and other States have at different times been modified by provisions for licensing those persons dealing in malt liquors, or malt and vinous liquors, exclusively. At present (1890) none of the State Prohibitory laws exempt the common retail sale of any of the light liquors; but the New Hampshire law is built partly upon the old model, since it permits the manufacture. In some of the States (especially those of the South) where Local Option is the prevailing policy, there are express exceptions of native wines. An enumeration of the license acts in which comparatively easy terms are or have been made for beer and wine-sellers, would necessitate citations from the statutes of almost every State of the Union. The existing law of Massachusetts fixes a license rate of only $250 a year for the sale of "malt liquors, cider and light wines containing less than 15 per cent. of alcohol, to be drunk on the premises," but requires the payment of $1,000 a year by those who sell "liquors of any kind, to be drunk on the premises;" the Illinois law, while establishing a minimum annual rate of $500 for retailers of all liquors, permits the retailing of malt liquors for $150,—etc.

But the tendency of recent legislation has been steadily toward abandoning these discriminations. States like Michigan and Ohio have abolished the special low beer-license rate. In most of the High License States—Minnesota, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, Missouri and others,—beer and wine are compelled to stand on the same footing with whiskey. And with each year the advocacy of "light liquors" is regarded with increasing impatience by the temperance people. A few veteran conservatives, whose disinterestedness is not questioned and whose sincerity is respected, still adhere to the old opinions. But it is well understood that in the organized temperance work as now conducted there is no toleration for the claims made by the champions of beer and wine. The hostility with which the recent efforts of Miss Kate Field to popularize California wines have been met, is evidence of the strength of feeling; and the discovery that Miss Field's labors were liberally rewarded by the California Viticultural Commission was not reassuring.[1]

The refusal to except beer and wine

---

[1] See the *Voice* for Dec. 6, 1888, Jan. 3, Jan. 24, July 4, Aug. 1 and Aug. 29, 1889.

from the general condemnation pronounced against alcoholic stimulants is based on extended and varied experience. A study of history does not encourage the belief that intemperance will disappear or play no important part where these lighter drinks are the only intoxicating beverages available. In the nations of antiquity (excepting, probably, China, and possibly one or two other remote Oriental countries), distillation was unknown; yet drink seduced and wrecked rulers and people alike, was a prominent subject for sages, historians and poets (see HISTORICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL) and was a chief contributor to the corruption, decay and ruin of the most glorious and admirable types of civilization. Neither were distilled liquors in use in mediæval times; but the accounts of the drunkenness that prevailed in those ages are abundant and appalling.

It is claimed by the persons who recommend light liquors that in the great wine and beer-drinking nations of the present day the evils of intemperance are comparatively slight. The grounds for this claim are not stated with definiteness; and those who seek the truth will discover many satisfactory reasons for holding the contrary view. From the standpoint of the beer and wine advocates, the most temperate nations are those in which the per capita consumption of spirits is smallest. Applying this test to France, the principal wine-producing country, we find from estimates made by the Chief of the United States Bureau of Statistics (based on original official data exclusively) that the consumption of spirits per capita in France in 1885 was 1.24 gallon, while in the United States the per capita consumption of spirits was 1.18 gallon in 1887 (see p. 135); a statistical volume issued by the French Government, ("Annuaire Statistique de la France" for 1888) shows that in the period from 1850 to 1885 the annual per capita consumption of spirits in France increased more than 200 per cent. (See p. 184.) Applying the same test to the United Kingdom and Germany, the leading beer nations, it is seen from the same estimates of the Chief of our Bureau of Statistics that the consumption of distilled liquors per capita is not very much less in these countries than in the United States. On the other hand the Dominion of Canada, which consumes less beer and wine than any other country for which statistics are given, shows a smaller per capita consumption of spirits than France, England or Germany;[1] and it is worthy of remark in this connection that Canada is a northern country, lying in latitudes where spirits are supposed to be in greatest request.

There is much direct evidence of the great and growing popularity of spirits in all the countries where malt and vinous liquors are plentiful and cheap. The frequent discussions of this subject by medical and other writers seem to leave no ground for controversy. The attention given to it at the recent "International Conferences Against the Abuse of Alcoholic Liquors," held in various Continental cities, also shows the magnitude of the evil. The development of the spirit traffic goes on steadily in every nation of beer and wine-drinkers. This fact certainly discourages belief in the practicability of efforts to popularize the lighter liquors.

But the question whether a national taste for beer and wine tends to hold the appetite for spirits in check is not the essential one. Where the mild drinks are distinctly preferred by the people, is drunkenness a comparatively rare vice, and are the evils springing from the use of alcoholic beverages comparatively insignificant? The dogmatic affirmative answers given by some American platform speakers are not justified by the deliberate testimony presented by competent observers in beer nations like England, Germany and Austria, and wine countries like France, Italy and Spain. Undoubtedly there is a large element of the population in each of these countries, no-

---

[1] The official figures are as follows:

	FOR THE YEAR 1887. PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION.		
	Wine, Gallons.	*Beer, Gallons.*	*Spirits, Gallons.*
France	26.74[1]	(*a*)	1.24[2]
United Kingdom	.38	32.88	.98
Germany	(*a*)	24.99	1.09
Canada	.10	3.50	.84

[1] For 1886. [2] For 1885. (*a*) No data.

These figures are from the quarterly report of the United States Bureau of Statistics for the three months ending March 31, 1889.

tably among the peasantry, that cannot be charged with gross intemperance; but a broad view is not cheering. Since the dawn of her history, beer has been the favorite drink of England; yet the fearful prevalence and results of intemperance there have been described in the strongest language by the most eminent Englishmen of all periods. More than two centuries ago Sir Matthew Hale, Lord Chief-Justice of England, declared that from his careful observations as a Judge, extending over 20 years, he had come to the conclusion that four-fifths of all the cases of offenses against the law were "the issues and products of excessive drinking." This was before the traffic in distilled spirits had reached alarming proportions. And Lord Chief-Justice Coleridge, speaking in our own day, when beer is still so esteemed by the English that the annual per capita consumption of this beverage is one-third greater in the United Kingdom than in Germany, said, in 1881, from the bench of the Supreme Court, that "Judges were weary with calling attention to drink as the principal cause of crime, but he could not refrain from saying that if they could make England sober they would shut up nine-tenths of the prisons." (For a valuable summary of notable facts and utterances concerning intemperance in England, see the "Foundation of Death," pp. 226–75.) In the other European countries to which we have particularly alluded, the reputation of the masses for sobriety and for freedom from the various ills with which intemperance is always associated is not of a high order. In the cities of the United States Americans have constantly before their eyes the suggestive fact that the freest drinkers as well as the most wretched sufferers from intemperance, and the most frequent offenders against law and order, are persons of foreign birth; and that a very considerable number of these persons are immigrants from the leading wine and beer nations.

In 1887 Mr. Albert Griffin made an exhaustive analysis of arrests for six years in New York City for 49 different offenses. He divided these offenses into two classes: (1) Those due to sudden passion, mere impulse, etc., not attributable specially to deliberation; (2) Those due to deliberation more than to sudden passion or mere impulse. He then selected and tabulated, under these heads, all the offenses committed by (1) persons of Irish birth, and (2) persons of German birth. The results derived were thus stated:[1]

	Irish.	Germans.
Population in 1880	198.595	163,482
Total offenses from 1881 to 1886	91,548	26,349
Average yearly offenses, ratio to population	1 to 13	1 to 37
Total unpremeditated offenses.	87,390	20,407
Average yearly unpremeditated offenses, ratio to population.	1 to 13.6	1 to 48
Total deliberate offenses	4,158	5,492
Average yearly deliberate offenses, ratio to population	1 to 286	1 to 165

Mr. Griffin also found that during these six years there were 16 attempts at suicide among the Irish and 31 among the Germans.

The interest of this analysis is enhanced when it is remembered that of all the citizens of the United States the Irish-born, as a class, are the freest whiskey-drinkers, and the German-born are the greatest beer-drinkers. While the whiskey-drinkers are shown to have committed more unpremeditated offenses, proportionately, than the beer-drinkers, the latter were responsible for a larger proportion of the deliberate crimes. The following comment was made by Mr. Griffin:

> "The Irish have never been considered an especially law-abiding people, but the Germans have. The former have much to depress them, and are proverbially reckless and improvident; while the latter are equally noted for general intelligence, prudence and thrift. Under these circumstances the Germans ought to be especially strong. . . . I do not believe that the Germans, as a race, are naturally more criminally disposed and law-defying than others, and I am strongly of the opinion that at least a part of the reason for the facts cited is to be found in the beverage they consume so much of. . . . Careful observers assert that it is more brutalizing in its effects than either spirituous or vinous liquors, in partial proof of which they point to the disproportionately large number of German names among the perpetrators of especially atrocious crimes published in the daily papers. . . . This idea is still further supported by the undeniable fact that Anarchism in this country is a German fungus, born and nurtured in beer-saloons and nowhere else."

The results of legislative discriminations in favor of the light liquors have uniformly been unsatisfactory. A memorable experiment was instituted in England in 1830, when the so-called Beer act went into effect. This measure permitted the sale of beer without license and without restrictions, provided stronger liquors were not vended in connection with beer: the retail trade in beer was made practically free. The consequences of this discrimination have been thus related:

---

[1] For the figures in detail, see "The Political Prohibitionist for 1888," pp. 80–1.

> “‘The idea entertained at that time,’ says the London *Times*, ‘was that free trade in beer would gradually wean men from the temptations of the regular tavern, would promote the consumption of a wholesome national beverage in place of ardent spirits, would break down the monopoly of the old license-houses, and impart, in short, a better character to the whole trade. . . . The results of this experiment did not confirm the expectations of its promoters. The sale of beer was increased; but the sale of spirituous liquors was not diminished.’
>
> “It had been in operation but a few weeks when Sidney Smith wrote: ‘The new Beer bill has begun its operations. Everybody is drunk. Those who are not singing are sprawling. The sovereign people are in a beastly state.’
>
> “In one year the number of beer-shops increased 30,000, without any diminution of the spirit-stores. In a short time the quantity of distilled liquors consumed was much larger than the gain in the consumption of beer. The official reports to Parliament show that
>
> “‘During the 10 years preceding the passage of the Beer-house act, the quantity of malt used for brewing was 268,139,389 bushels; during the 10 years immediately succeeding, the quantity was 344,143,550 bushels, showing an increase of 28 per cent. During the 10 years 1821–30, the quantity of British spirits consumed was 57,970,963 gallons, and during the next 10 years it rose to 76,797,365 gallons—an increase of 32 per cent.
>
> “‘The licenses for the sale of spirits—of which, in 1830, 48,904 were granted—numbered in 1833, 50,828, being an increase of 1,924. In Sheffield 300 beer-shops were added to the old complement of public houses; and it is a striking fact that before the second year had transpired not less than 110 of the keepers of these houses had applied for spirit licenses, to satisfy the desire for ardent spirits.’
>
> “There could be no more startling demonstration of the folly on which the Beer act was based,—the expectation that ‘free beer’ would diminish the demand for ardent spirits. Concerning these beer-houses Lord Brougham said in 1839, in the House of Lords:
>
> “‘To what good was it that the Legislature should pass laws to punish crime, or that their Lordships should occupy themselves in finding out modes of improving the morals of the people by giving them education? What could be the use of sowing a little seed here and plucking up a weed there, if these beer-shops were to be continued that they might go on to sow the seeds of immorality broadcast over the land, germinating the most frightful produce that ever had been allowed to grow up in a civilized country, and, he was ashamed to add, under the fostering care of Parliament, and throwing its baleful influences over the whole community?’”[1]

All the American attempts to reduce drunkenness by encouraging the exclusive sale of malt and vinous liquors have been signal failures. By nearly all persons except a few theorists it is recognized that there is no possibility of separating the beer and wine traffic from the spirit traffic, or giving the former an appearance of superior respectability and decency. The vast majority of persons who frequent the saloons are not abstainers from distilled spirits; and as a rule the saloon-keeper who has no whiskey for sale must be content with but a small patronage. Even under the discriminating law of Massachusetts, which permits the retail sale of beer and wine for $250 per year but charges $1,000 per year for the privilege of retailing whiskey, the large inducement held out to beer and wine-sellers is not taken advantage of to any important extent. The beer-brewers and not the whiskey-traders are responsible for the systematic planting of saloons in the great cities, and thus for stimulating the whole retail business in the most artful, painstaking and demoralizing way. (See Liquor Traffic.) The shops which are essentially retail agencies for the brewery are, with few exceptions, the foulest and most dangerous dens existing; and they are the favorite places of rendezvous for harlots, blackguards, gamblers and criminals. The wine interest in America, wherever it is powerful enough to dominate the retail liquor trade, shows itself to be wholly offensive. The advocates of “light wines” favor High License, rigid restrictions, discrimination against spirits and an elegant respectability; but in California, where the wine men have full control, one of the lowest license rates prevailing anywhere exists, the restrictions are feeble (even sales on Sunday being permitted by law—a permission conceded by only one other important State), no attempt is made to limit the traffic in whiskey and the wine-shops are without redeeming features.

---

[1] Alcohol in History (New York, 1887), by Richard Eddy, D.D., pp. 358–9.

If a chief object of the present reform movement is to diminish temptations it seems needless to discuss seriously the general proposition that wine and beer are in themselves less harmful than spirits. The merits of this proposition depend upon the part practically played by wine and beer in the alcoholic scheme. It is undoubted that these beverages, and not spirits, are the great tempters of the young, the innocent and the ignorant. The records of prisons, infirmaries and other institutions show that the vast majority of the inmates began their careers of intemperance as beer or wine drinkers.

But from a strictly scientific point of view there is ample authority for ranking beer and wine with the worst intoxicants. The *Scientific American*, April 19, 1879, printed an article credited to the *Quarterly Journal of Inebriety*, as follows:[1]

"For some years past a decided inclination has been apparent all over the country to give up the use of whiskey and other strong alcohols, using as a subtitute beer and other compounds. This is evidently founded on the idea that beer is not harmful and contains a large amount of nutriment; also that bitters may have some medical quality which will neutralize the alcohol it conceals, etc.

"These theories are without confirmation in the observations of physicians and chemists. The use of beer is found to produce a species of degeneration of all the organism, profound and deceptive. Fatty deposits, diminished circulation, conditions of congestion, perversion of functional activities, local inflammations of both the liver and the kidneys are constantly present. Intellectually a stupor amounting almost to paralysis, arrests the reason, changing all the higher faculties into mere animalism, sensual, selfish, sluggish, varied only with paroxysms of anger that are senseless and brutal. In appearance the beer-drinker may be the picture of health, but in reality he is most incapable of resisting disease. A slight injury, a severe cold, or shock to the body or mind, will commonly provoke acute disease, ending fatally. Compared with inebriates who use different kinds of alcohol he is more incurable, more generally diseased. The constant use of beer every day gives the system no recuperation but steadily lowers the vital forces. It is our observation that beer-drinking in this country produces the very lowest form of inebriety, closely allied to criminal insanity. The most dangerous class of ruffians in our large cities are beer-drinkers. It is asserted by competent authority that the evils of heredity are more positive in this class than from other alcoholics. Recourse to beer as a substitute for other forms of alcohol merely increases the danger and fatality. Public sentiment and legislation should comprehend that all forms of alcohol are dangerous when used."

And Dr. Norman Kerr says in his "Inebriety" (pp. 66–7):

"Beer-drinkers are specially liable to structural alteration and enlargement of the liver, often complicated with dropsy, and to rheumatism, gout and rheumatic gout. Disordered digestion and sluggish circulation are also frequently present. So far from being innocent and healthful articles of diet, beer, stout *et hoc genus omne*, are noxious and unwholesome luxuries, with no practical food value, and by their vitiation of the blood a fertile cause of degeneration, disease and death. Among the sequelæ of beer-drinking are an impeded and loaded circulation, embarrassed respiration, functional perversions, hepatic and renal congestions, with a stupor tending toward paralysis and a diminished as well as weighted vitality which invites disease and easily succumbs to its ravages. Many beer inebriates are subjects of this form of inebriety, though they rarely if ever die boisterous in their cups. They lead what may be called an 'intemperate' life—drinkers to excess, albeit not what are commonly called 'drunkards.' They are beer-soakers, human sponges with an enormous capacity for the absorption of malt liquor. Of the cases which have been under my own observation, while one gallon a day has been a moderate allowance, I have known eight gallons consumed in one period of 24 hours. The general average per day has been one-half gallon. I have, however, seen intractable disease and premature death result from less than a quarter of this quantity drunk daily over a term of years. Psychologically, the beer habit has in the long run a depressing effect, even when taken in fairly 'moderate' quantities. Lager beer, which by many is declared to be a temperate, safe and wholesome drink, is by no means so. Its daily imbibition, long-continued, tends to melancholy, ending occasionally in self-destruction. There is also no small proportion of the cases of the general paralysis of inebriety arising from beer. Such wines as port and sherry are so fortified that they might fairly be classed as spirits. Gout and dyspepsia are their respective concomitants. Champagnes are most truly painful in the process of 'tapering off.' I know of no distress and discomfort from any kind of drink at all approaching the miseries of the day after a debauch on champagne."

[See also LONGEVITY.]

Lincoln, Abraham, sixteenth President of the United States; born on a farm near Hodgensville in La Rue (at that time Hardin) County, Ky., Feb. 12, 1809; shot by an assassin in Ford's Theatre at Washington, D. C., April 14, 1865, and died the next day.

Throughout his career Lincoln was a

---

[1] This article has been widely copied, and in some books on the drink question (notably the "Foundation of Death," p. 140), the *Scientific American* is named as the journal in which it was originally published. This is erroneous, as indicated above.

total abstainer; and his sympathy with the most radical temperance ideas and the demand for the severest legislation was strong and apparently underwent no change. This can be demonstrated as satisfactorily as any other claim respecting the tendency of his less conspicuous non-official utterances and actions. But since his total abstinence and Prohibition sentiments were delivered in local and uninfluential meetings, in the obscurity of the West, during a period of his life when no special significance attached to his views; since the anti-liquor work in which he took part was wholly educative and had no political developments, and since the temperance cause suffered almost complete eclipse in the years of his national prominence, most of his biographers have failed to give special attention to this feature of his record. It has always been known to those particularly interested in total abstinence that Lincoln was a supporter of their principles; but no effort was made to ascertain the strength and extent of his sympathy until recent bold forgeries by the unscrupulous defenders of the drink traffic led to investigation.

In the very exciting Local Option contest in Atlanta, Ga., in 1887, the anti-Prohibitionists, as a means of influencing the large negro vote, issued a flaming circular picturing Lincoln in the act of striking the chains from a slave, while underneath were printed these words: "Prohibition will work great injury to the cause of temperance. . . . A Prohibitory law strikes a blow at the very principles on which our Government was founded."[1] Similar utterances were attributed to him in various newspapers (notably the Sioux Falls *Leader*) in the North and South Dakota Amendment campaigns of 1889,[2] and in a pamphlet entitled "Prosperity, and How to Obtain It," which was circulated by the so-called "State Business Men's and Bankers' Association" in Nebraska in 1890.[3] These were submitted by the *Voice* to Mr. John G. Nicolay, Lincoln's private secretary and biographer, and he pronounced them spurious.[4]

The following facts and quotations have been gathered from various sources, and leave no room for doubt:

In his youth, when about 17 years old, Lincoln prepared an article on "Temperance," which was shown to Rev. Aaron Farmer, a Baptist preacher, and by him furnished to an Ohio newspaper for publication.[1] On Feb. 22, 1842, he delivered an address before the Washingtonian Temperance Society of Springfield, Ill.,[2] in which he said:

> "Whether or not the world would be vastly benefited by a total and final banishment from it of all intoxicating drinks, seems to me not now an open question. Three-fourths of mankind confess the affirmative with their tongues; and, I believe, all the rest acknowledge it in their hearts. Ought any, then, to refuse their aid in doing what the good of the whole demands? . . . There seems ever to have been a proneness in the brilliant and warm-blooded to fall into this vice—the demon of intemperance ever seems to have delighted in sucking the blood of genius and generosity. What one of us but can call to mind some relative, more promising in youth than all his fellows, who has fallen a victim to his rapacity? He ever seems to have gone forth like the Egyptian angel of death, commissioned to slay, if not the first, the fairest born of every family. Shall he now be arrested in his desolating career? . . . If the relative grandeur of revolutions shall be estimated by the great amount of human misery they alleviate and the small amount they inflict, then, indeed, will this be the grandest the world shall ever have seen. Of our political revolution of '76 we are all justly proud. . . . But . . . it . . . had its evils too. . . . Turn now to the temperance revolution. In it we shall find a stronger bondage broken, a viler slavery manumitted, a greater tyrant deposed—in it more of want supplied, more disease healed, more sorrow assuaged; by it no orphan's starving, no widow's weeping. . . . And what a natural ally this to the cause of political freedom; with such an aid its march cannot fail to be on and on, till every son of earth shall drink in rich fruition the sorrow-quenching draughts of perfect liberty. . . . And when the victory shall be complete, when there shall be neither a slave nor a drunkard on the earth, how proud the title of that land which may truly claim to be the birth-place and the cradle of both those revolutions that shall have ended in that victory! How nobly distinguished that people who shall have planted and nurtured to maturity both the political and moral freedom of their species!"

W. H. Herndon, for many years Lincoln's law partner, writes of the circumstances attending the delivery of this address:

"Early in 1842 he entered into the Washingtonian movement organized to suppress the evils of intemperance. At the request of the Society he delivered an admirable address, on Washington's Birthday, in the Presbyterian Church. . . . I . . . remember well how one paragraph of Lincoln's speech offended the church members who were present. Speaking of certain Christians who objected to the association of drunkards, even with the chance of reforming them, he said: 'If they [the Christians] believe as they profess, that Omnipotence condescended to take on himself the form of sinful man, and as such to die an ignominious death for their sakes, surely they will not refuse submission to the infinitely lesser condescension, for the temporal and perhaps eternal salvation of a large, erring and unfortunate class of their fellow-creatures. Nor is the condescension very great. In my judgment such of us as have never fallen victims have been spared more from the absence of appetite than from any mental or moral superiority over those who have. Indeed, I believe if we take habitual drunkards as a class their heads and their hearts will bear an advantageous comparison with those of any other class.' The avowal of these sentiments proved to be an unfortunate thing for Lincoln. The professing Christians regarded the suspicion suggested in the first sentence as a reflection on the sincerity of their belief, and the last one had no better effect in reconciling them to his views. I was at the door of the church as the people passed out, and heard them discussing the speech. Many of them were open in the expression of their displeasure. 'It's a shame,' I heard one man say, 'that he should be permitted to abuse us so in the house of the Lord.' The truth was, the Society was composed mainly of the roughs and drunkards of the town, who had evinced a desire to reform. Many of them were too fresh from the gutter to be taken at once into the society of such people as worshipped at the church where the speech was delivered. Neither was there that concert of effort so universal to-day between the churches and temperance societies to rescue the fallen. The whole thing, I repeat, was damaging to Lincoln, and gave rise to the opposition on the part of the churches which confronted him several years afterward when he became a candidate against the noted Peter Cartwright for Congress. The charge these bore, that in matters of religion he was a skeptic, was not without its supporters, especially when his opponent was himself a preacher. But nothing daunted, Lincoln kept on and labored zealously in the interests of the temperance movement."[1]

---

[1] See the *Voice*, Jan. 19, 1888. [2] Ibid, Aug. 15, 1889. [3] Ibid, Sept. 4, 1890. [4] Ibid, Aug. 15, 1889, and Sept. 4, 1890.

[1] Life of Lincoln, by William H. Herndon and Jesse W. Weik (Chicago, 1889), vol. 1, p. 61. Also Ward H. Lamon's "Life of Lincoln" (Boston, 1872), pp. 68-9.

[2] It was originally printed in the Springfield *Journal*, and is reprinted in the "Lincoln Memorial Volume" (pp. 84-97), edited by O. H. Oldroyd (New York, 1882).

It is to this period in Lincoln's career that Mr. Lamon refers in his "Life of Lincoln" when he says (p. 480) that "for many years he [Lincoln] was an ardent agitator against the use of intoxicating beverages, and made speeches far and near in favor of total abstinence. Some of them were printed, and of one he was not a little proud."

In 1852 Lincoln joined an organization of the Sons of Temperance, in Springfield, Ill. In 1853 a lecture entitled "A Discourse on the Bottle—Its Evils and the Remedy" was delivered in Springfield by Rev. James Smith. A request for the publication of this address, on the ground that its general circulation would be beneficial, was signed by a number of persons, including Lincoln, who thus endorsed such sentiments as the following, which it contained:

> "The liquor traffic is a cancer in society, eating out its vitals and threatening destruction; and all attempts to regulate it will not only prove abortive but aggravate the evil. No, there must be no more attempts to regulate the cancer: it must be eradicated; not a root must be left behind, for, until this be done, all classes must continue exposed to become the victims of strong drink. . . . The most effectual [remedy] would be the passage of a law altogether abolishing the liquor traffic, except for mechanical, chemical, medicinal and sacramental purposes, and so framed that no principle of the Constitution of the State or of the United States be violated."[1]

Several accounts have been written of Lincoln's refusal to furnish intoxicating liquors to the Committee which visited him at his home in Springfield, June 19, 1860, to formally notify him of his nomination for President by the Republican Convention in Chicago the day before. Dr. J. G. Holland says:

> "Mr. Ashmun, the President of the Convention, at the head of a Committee, visited Springfield to apprise Mr. Lincoln officially of his nomination. In order that the ceremony might be smoothly performed, the Committee had an interview with Mr. Lincoln before the hour appointed for the formal call. They found him at a loss to know how to treat a present he had just received at the hands of some of his considerate Springfield friends. Knowing Mr. Lincoln's temperate or rather abstinent habits, and laboring under the impression that the visitors from Chicago would have wants beyond the power of cold water to satisfy, these friends had sent in sundry hampers of wines and liquors. These strange fluids troubled Mr. Lincoln, and he frankly confessed as much to the members of the Committee. The Chairman at once advised him to return the gift and to offer no stimulants to his guests, as many would be present besides the Committee. Thus relieved, he made ready for the reception of the company according to his own ideas of hospitality."[2]

F. B. Carpenter, in his little book, "Six Months at the White House with Abraham Lincoln" (New York, 1866), declares in the Introduction that he has satisfied himself of the correctness of all the statements to which he gives publicity; and on p. 125 he reprints the following from the Portland *Press:*

---

[1] Herndon's "Life of Lincoln," vol. 2, pp. 260–2.

[1] See the *Voice*, Aug. 29, 1889.

[2] Holland's "Life of Lincoln" (Springfield, Mass., 1866), pp. 228–9.

"After this ceremony had passed [the notification of nomination and Lincoln's reply], Mr. Lincoln remarked to the company that as an appropriate conclusion to an interview so important and interesting as that which had just transpired, he supposed good manners would require that he should treat the Committee with something to drink; and opening a door that led into a room in the rear he called out, 'Mary! Mary!' A girl replied to the call, to whom Mr. Lincoln spoke a few words in an undertone, and, closing the door, returned again to converse with his guests. In a few minutes the maiden entered, bearing a large waiter containing several glass tumblers, and a large pitcher in the midst, and placed it upon the centre-table. Mr. Lincoln arose, and gravely addressing the company said: 'Gentlemen, we must pledge our mutual healths in the most healthy beverage which God has given to man. It is the only beverage I have ever used or allowed in my family, and I cannot conscientiously depart from it on the present occasion. It is pure Adam's ale from the spring.' And taking a tumbler he touched it to his lips and pledged them his highest respects in a cup of cold water. Of course all his guests were constrained to admire his consistency and to join in his example."

The *Voice* for Oct. 10, 1889, printed in *fac-simile* an autograph letter which had never before been published, written by Lincoln to J. Mason Haight, in which Lincoln referred to this incident as follows:

"PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL.—SPRINGFIELD, ILL., June 11, 1860.—J. Mason Haight, Esq.—*My Dear Sir:* I think it would be improper for me to write or say anything to or for the public upon the subject of which you inquire. I therefore wish the letter I do write to be held as strictly confidential. Having kept house 16 years, and having never held the 'cup' to the lips of my friends then, my judgment was that I should not, in my new position, change my habits in this respect. What actually occurred upon the occasion of the Committee visiting me I think it would be better for others to say.—Yours respectfully,

"A. LINCOLN."

Sept. 29, 1863, a deputation from the Grand Division of Sons of Temperance of the District of Columbia waited upon President Lincoln, and submitted some recommendations in behalf of promoting temperance in the army. In his response the President said:[1]

"As a matter of course, it will not be possible for me to make a response coextensive with the address which you have presented to me. If I were better known than I am, you would not need to be told that in the advocacy of the cause of temperance you have a friend and sympathizer in me. When I was a young man—long ago,—before the Sons of Temperance as an organization had an existence, I in an humble way made temperance speeches, and I think I may say that to this day I have never by my example belied what I then said. In regard to the suggestions which you make for the purpose of the advancement of the cause of temperance in the army, I cannot make particular responses to them at this time. To prevent intemperance in the army is even a part of the articles of war. It is part of the law of the land, and was so, I presume, long ago, to dismiss officers for drunkenness. I am not sure that, consistently with the public service, more can be done than has been done. All, therefore, that I can promise you is (if you will be pleased to furnish me with a copy of your address) to have it submitted to the proper department and have it considered whether it contains any suggestions which will improve the cause of temperance and repress the cause of drunkenness in the army any better than it is already done. I can promise no more than that. I think that the reasonable men of the world have long since agreed that intemperance is one of the greatest if not the very greatest of all evils amongst mankind. That is not a matter of dispute, I believe. That the disease exists, and that it is a very great one, is agreed upon by all."

As President, Lincoln inaugurated or approved a number of measures Prohibitory in character; and the friendship that he manifested causes the English temperance historian, Dr. Dawson Burns, to remark that in his assassination "the friends of temperance had a special reason for regret, as this crime deprived them of the moral support of one who had for many years been a personal example of the practice they desired should become universal. In his official capacity he had also given a sanction to all measures which could advance the movement in the army and the nation at large."[1] In 1861 Generals Butler, McClellan and Banks issued orders excluding all liquors from their respective commands; and on Aug. 5 of the same year the President signed an act of Congress providing

"That it shall not be lawful for any person in the District of Columbia to sell, give or administer to any soldier or volunteer in the service of the United States, or any person wearing the uniform of such soldier or volunteer, any spirituous liquor or intoxicating drink; and every person offending against the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof, before a magistrate or Court having criminal jurisdiction, shall be punished by a fine of $25 or imprisonment for 30 days." (U. S. Statutes at Large, vol. 12, c. 44.)

---

[1] Specially transcribed for this work by J. K. Bridge, 917 French street, Washington, D. C., from the official report published at the time by the Sons of Temperance.

[1] Temperance History, vol. 2, p. 61.

By an act of Congress signed by President Lincoln March 19, 1862, the Inspectors-General of the army were constituted a board of officers to prepare a list or schedule of the articles sold by sutlers to the officers and soldiers in the volunteer service, "provided always [as to this list or schedule] that no intoxicating liquors shall at any time be contained therein, or the sale of such liquors be in any way authorized by said board." (U. S. Statutes at Large, vol. 12, c. 47, § 1.) As a result of the agitation of temperance reformers, supported by the urgent recommendations of such men as Rear-Admiral Foote and Captains Dupont, Hudson and Stringham of the navy, an act of Congress, with the following provision enforcing the total prohibition of the use of spirituous liquors in the navy for beverage purposes, was signed by the President July 14, 1862 :

> "And be it further enacted, That from and after the 1st day of September, 1862, the spirit ration in the navy of the United States shall forever cease, and thereafter no distilled spirituous liquors shall be admitted on board of vessels of war except as medical stores, and upon the order and under the control of the medical officers of such vessels, and to be used only for medical purposes. From and after the said 1st day of September next there shall be allowed and paid to each person in the navy now entitled to the spirit ration five cents per day in commutation and lieu thereof, which shall be in addition to their present pay." (U. S. Statutes at Large, vol. 12, c. 164, § 4.)

President Lincoln was also one of the 12 signers of the Presidential temperance declaration. (See DELAVAN, EDWARD C.)

Liqueurs.—Spirituous drinks and flavors compounded from alcohol and various aromatic substances, herbs, etc., by special processes. Liqueurs are of as many varieties, almost, as wines. Chartreuse, curacoa, maraschino, benedictine, ratafia, absinthe, vermouth and kirschenwasser are among the best-known. (See SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS.)

Liquor.—When used in a general way, without designating the particular beverage, this word applies to alcoholic drinks of all kinds.

Liquor Traffic.—In one respect the early American temperance agitators labored under conditions decidedly less unfavorable than those existing at the present time : they were not opposed by a thoroughly organized, resourceful, cunning, vigilant, politically powerful, wealthy and carefully entrenched liquor traffic. In those days the manufacturers and vendors of liquor, though perhaps more numerous in proportion to the total population than are the makers and dealers of to-day, were almost entirely independent of one another, having no strong societies and no authorized leaders, and making few united efforts to counteract the reform movement or to control politics and legislation. Moreover, the retail traffic was then conducted chiefly in inns and groceries, as a branch of other and reputable lines of trade : the saloon of to-day was scarcely suggested by the drinking establishments of the first half of the century, and the rumsellers had little of that "enterprise" which is now so conspicuous and so baleful. Prejudice, indifference and individual appetite were serious obstacles to temperance progress ; but though the antagonism of the drink-traffickers was also to be contended with, this was not a concentrated or well-directed antagonism, and, so far as its practical influence upon public policy was concerned, was scarcely more formidable than the unorganized opposition of other citizens of equal number.

PAST AND PRESENT.

In the social history of the United States in the 19th Century there is hardly anything so remarkable as the change effected in the character and conduct of the liquor traffic during the 40 years from 1850 to 1890. The idea of dram-selling is no longer associated with the thought of unpretentious and carelessly-managed taverns and general stores ; these establishments cut no figure in the retail liquor system now. In every city and nearly every town above the hamlet rank, probably at least 95 per cent. of the retail liquor business is done in places fitted up and operated for the exclusive or principal purpose of selling intoxicants—places affording few or no conveniences for the public, in which none of the necessaries of life are kept for sale to the people at large; places which no decent woman can enter, unescorted, under any circumstances, and where no child or youth can safely be permitted to set foot. These establishments, so far as they serve other purposes than the distribution of drink, do so only with the design of catering to the incidental wants and vices of drinkers and increasing the attractions of which the drinking-bar is the center; restaurants are found in connection with some saloons and certain kinds of food are obtainable in nearly all of them, tobacco and non-alcoholic beverages are invariably kept, billiards, pool-tables, cards and other gambling paraphernalia are almost always present, prostitutes are harbored or encouraged in most instances, and newspapers and music are frequently provided, only as associated and contributing features of the one absorbing vocation of liquor-selling. This vocation is driven with an energy and a wantonness of which there were few examples in former years, while the traditional "mine host" has given way to the foreign-born saloon-keeper, who is without standing in respectable society and is commonly ranked with the lowest and criminal classes. The characteristic taproom shows a lavishness and skill of expenditure suggestive of ample capital, and the dealers cheerfully pay license fees that are sometimes as large as a fair annual income; in fact these license fees, in a number of States, probably range higher than the actual profits of the small retail rumseller in the old days.

The present compact organization and prodigious political strength of the traffic are even more instructive evidences of the great change that has been wrought. The insignificant part played by the liquor interest in the Prohibitory agitation of 40 years ago seems grotesque when viewed by the light of existing conditions. To-day it is counted among the impossibilities to pass a Prohibitory statute through any Legislature without waging prolonged and arduous battles with the "rum power," whose resources appear to be inexhaustible; but in the decade beginning with 1850 it was with no great difficulty that Legislatures were persuaded to enact the Maine law. The former inactivity and weakness of the traffic can be explained only by saying that the early license systems did not encourage brisk competition in the trade, or excite rivalry and enterprise, or hold out to a select few the prospects of large profits, or erect the liquor business into a place of peculiar prominence. The license rates were low, and more important than that there were no serious efforts made to increase them. This fact is of great importance; for if the expenses incidental to conducting a licensed establishment had been subject to sudden and material change by legislative imposition of increased license charges, organization would no doubt have been perfected without delay and the revolution in the traffic would have been accomplished more speedily. While the dealers naturally regarded the total abstinence and Prohibition work with disgust and fear, the license privileges which they held were, on account of the low rates and practical free trade then prevailing, not specially valuable. The manufacture of liquor was not taxed by the Federal Government, the brewing "industry" was in its infancy, whiskey was cheap and small stills were numerous, large investments of capital were exceptional, and the liquor-makers did not find it necessary to employ political influence and watch the details of national legislation.

FEDERATION AND CONCENTRATION.

Organization of the United States Brewers' Association (1862). — The United States Brewers' Association was organized at a meeting of representative brewers, held in New York, Nov. 12, 1862. In the summer of that year (July 1) Congress had passed an act to take effect in September, 1862, levying taxes on domestic liquors, including a tax of $1 per barrel on beer. This was done to meet the expenses occasioned by the Civil War. Thus the beginning of practical organized action was almost simultaneous with the first interference by the general Government in the affairs of the "trade."[1] The brewers apparently did not foresee the advantages that they would derive from the new system; for at their first convention they objected to the tax and took steps to secure a reduction. Despite the Government's necessities the brewers' demands were so respectfully listened to that by the act of March 3, 1863, the tax on beer was reduced from $1 to 60 cents per barrel; and although the $1 tax was subsequently restored (April 1, 1864), this restoration was not seriously opposed by the brewers, and the $1 rate has been left undisturbed until the present time (1891). Taxation of the liquor traffic for revenue purposes has indeed been the uninterrupted policy of the Federal Government since 1862; and the pursuance of this policy has necessarily implied possible changes in important matters of detail. The need of continued organization and of unflagging attention to politics has therefore been constantly recognized by the brewers, and their national Association has become a very formidable power. In October, 1877, it was made an incorporated body under the laws of New York State. The closest relations have been established between its officers and the authorities in charge of the Internal Revenue Department (see UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC), and its influence in Congress and throughout the country has been felt many times and in many ways. During the 28 years of its existence the quantity of beer brewed in the United States has increased wonderfully: only 2,006,625 barrels were produced in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1863; but there were 25,119,853 barrels manufactured in 1888-9. Reports made at the United States Brewers' Convention in 1888 showed that 78.4 per cent. of the whole beer product of 1887-8 was made by members of the Association.

---

[1] In Washington's Administration taxes were laid by Congress upon distilled liquors, and the Pennsylvania distillers promptly showed their resentment by rising in armed rebellion. Strictly speaking, this famous insurrection was the first manifestation of the banded liquor power in American history. But it was merely a seditious outbreak, which spent its force in a brief time. The effective organization and political influence of the drink traffic as now understood date from 1862, the year in which the Internal Revenue act was passed.

Creation of the Organized Whiskey Power.—The act of July 1, 1862, taxed distilled spirits as well as beer, and the consolidation of the whiskey interest began soon after the passage of that measure. From the original tax of 20 cents per gallon on spirits the tax was increased (March 7, 1864) to 60 cents per gallon, and again (June 30, 1864) to $1.50 per gallon, and again (Dec. 22, 1864) to $2 per gallon; after the war it was reduced to 50 cents (June 20, 1868), then raised to 70 cents (June 6, 1872), and finally (March 3, 1875) fixed at the present rate of 90 cents. The heavy tax, together with the elaborate regulations prescribed for distilleries, had the effect of concentrating the manufacturing business, bringing large investors into it and substituting for the old and not very vigilant or enterprising distillers a band of keen-witted and aggressive individuals, whose characteristics gave an entirely new significance to the name "whiskey men." The distillers have never revealed their organized national strength with the frankness and formality exhibited by the brewers; they have not held annual public conventions, and they evidently wish to have it believed that they are bound together by loose ties. But it is apparent to watchful observers that the whiskey power is quite as carefully disciplined for practical purposes and quite as arrogant as the beer power. It is prepared at all times to send to Washington skilful lobbyists with unlimited resources, it has procured extraordinary concessions from the highest executive officers of the Government, and it has special representatives in both Houses of Congress—men of commanding ability and great influence.

The Wine Manufacturers.—The third branch of liquor manufacture, the wine interest, has not until recently attained prominence. Wine production in the United States has always been confined to a few localities where natural conditions are particularly favorable to grape culture; and this circumstance, with the preference shown for foreign wines and the uninviting quality of the native product, has hitherto prevented the wine-makers from taking rank with the whiskey men and beer-brewers. But there has been a marked advance in the last few years: while only 1,860,008 gallons of domestic wine were produced in 1860, 3,059,518 gallons in 1870 and 17,404,698 gallons in 1885, the production in 1888 was 31,630,523 gallons.[1] Wealthy and shrewd men have obtained control of the vineyards of California, and by untiring efforts have persuaded the State to enact laws specially fostering the wine interest and giving those connected with it an importance not enjoyed by any other agricultural or commercial class, to create an official "Viticultural Commission," to guarantee the purity of California wines and to industriously seek purchasers for them throughout the country. Thus the cheap and crude stuff produced in California, which could not win its way on its merits, has been rapidly pushed to the front by the same means that have enabled the brewers and distillers to strengthen their hold upon the public—by organization and systematic management.

---

[1] Estimates of W. F. Switzler, Chief of the United States Bureau of Statistics under President Cleveland. (See p. 129.)

The English Brewery Syndicates.—Of equal importance with the tendency toward federation is that looking to proximate monopolization of the liquor-manufacturing interests. In the brewing "trade" this latter tendency has had striking development. Extensive purchases of American breweries have been made by English syndicates, whose public operations were begun in 1888. The profits of brewing properties in the United States have always been large, and the reports made by agents of British capitalists soon created an active demand for them on the London market. Several great companies were organized,[1] and the result is the practical consolidation for corporate purposes, by the manipulation of a few Englishmen and within a few months' time, of 82 brewing and malting establishments, valued at more than $81,000,000,[2] and producing in the aggregate about one-sixth of all the malt liquor manufactured in this country. The following details of English syndicate purchases are compiled from a table printed in the *Brewers' Journal* (New York) for Dec. 1, 1890:

Number of breweries and malting houses bought by the English syndicates to that date, 82.

The sales of these establishments for the year ending May 1, 1890, aggregated 4,461,177 barrels. These 82 concerns had been reorganized into 23 new companies. Thus 23 companies were made to transact the business formerly done by 82 breweries. In the city of St. Louis alone, 19 breweries were consolidated into one.

Cities in which purchases have been made by the English syndicates: Baltimore, 4 (consolidated into two); Rochester, 3 (consolidated into one); Philadelphia, 1; Chicago, 7 (consolidated into two); Cincinnati, 1, and Aurora (Ind.), 1 (consolidated into one); Denver, 2 (consolidated into one); Detroit, 5 (consolidated into two); New York, 4, Newark, 5 and Albany, 1 (consolidated into three); Peoria, 4, Joliet, 1 and Wilmington (Ill.), 1 (consolidated into one); Indianapolis, 3 (consolidated into one); Boston, 4, Lawrence (Mass.), 1 and Portsmouth (N. H.), 1 (consolidated into two); St. Louis, 19 (consolidated into one); San Francisco, 7, San José, 1, Oakland (Cal.), 1 and West Berkeley (Cal.), 1 (consolidated into one); Springfield (O.), 2 (consolidated into one); Washington, 1.

The stated values of the shares and bonds of the 82 enumerated establishments is £16,663,000 ($81,148,810, reckoning a pound sterling at $4.87).[3]

Of the 23 brewery companies (as reorganized) every one represents a stated investment of more than $500,000 and only six are capitalized at less than $1,000,000; while eight are rated at about $4,000,000 and one has a value of nearly $14,000,000.

Of the brewery companies for which the last annual dividends are given, one paid as high as 16 per cent., four paid 15 per cent. and only one paid less than 10 per cent.

In these English syndicate transactions a majority of the brewery stock (in nearly all instances two-thirds) was subscribed by the foreign capitalists, who thus obtained a controlling interest in each case. A minority of the stock (as a rule, not in excess of one-third) was taken by the former American owners, who were also bound by the terms of the contracts to operate the breweries for at least three years.[4] Only the choicest properties, from the investor's point of view, have been sought by British capitalists, and naturally the combinations effected are formidable in all respects. It is noticeable, however, that the greatest breweries of the country, like the Anheuser-Busch of St. Louis, the Pabst of Milwaukee and George Ehret's of New York, have not succumbed to the syndicates; the leading breweries, with few exceptions, are still conducted by independent companies.

---

[1] The principal English syndicates interested are the City of London Contract Corporation, the Executors' Trustees' Securities Company and the London Debenture Corporation. (Stated on the authority of A. E. J. Tovey, editor of the *Brewers' Journal*.)

[2] It is undoubted, however, that the breweries, as floated on the London market, have been very much over-capitalized, the object being, as in all such instances, to enrich the negotiators or stock-jobbers without regard to the subsequent rates of dividends to investors. It is of course impossible to estimate the extent of the over-capitalization.

[3] See p. 380.

[4] Stated on the authority of A. E. J. Tovey, editor of the *Brewers' Journal*.

The syndicates have acquired many establishments of the second, third and fourth ranks, and by consolidating them have created companies that rival the oldest and strongest ones formerly existing. The dominating influence previously enjoyed in the markets of the country by a few breweries is therefore threatened by the sudden appearance of new competitors, and a more thorough concentration is logically indicated. Yet the monopoly movement has by no means brought the brewing interest in general under "trust" dictation; and it cannot even be said that a majority of the beer product is controlled by a handful of autocratic individuals. The half-dozen English syndicates, as already shown, produce, in the aggregate, about 4,500,000 barrels annually; the Anheuser-Busch Brewing Association of St. Louis sold 626,692 barrels in the fiscal year 1889-90; the Pabst Brewing Company of Milwaukee sold 608,231 barrels; the Joseph Schlitz Brewing Company of Milwaukee, 418,834 barrels, and George Ehret of New York, 394,627 barrels. These are the largest producers, and their combined output is about 6,500,000 barrels, leaving more than 21,000,000 barrels manufactured by some 2,000 smaller concerns. On the other hand, the significance of recent monopolization undertakings is not to be discredited. They have not only created powerful corporations but have stimulated speculation and competition on a great scale throughout the "trade," and demonstrated to all individual brewers the commercial advantage of intelligent combination.

Distillers' Combinations. — Although there has been no similar absorption of distilleries by English or other syndicates, the business of distilling is practically conducted by "pools" and "trusts" clothed with arbitrary power. Several distinctions must be held in view in speaking of the trade management of this branch of liquor manufacture. In the United States distilleries are of three classes—those using grain, those using molasses and those using fruit. In the year ended June 30, 1889, there were 1,440 grain distilleries (of which 1,267 were operated), producing 87,887,456 gallons of spirits; 10 molasses distilleries (all of which were operated), producing 1,471,054 gallons and 3,126 fruit distilleries (of which 3,072 were operated), producing 1,775,040 gallons.[1] Thus nearly the entire product of spirituous liquors came from the grain distilleries. This is accounted for by the comparative cheapness and greater availability of grain. Fruit, which is perishable, is very expensive or wholly unobtainable, except during a few months of the year; and the fruit distilleries are operated solely for supplying a limited demand for apple, peach and grape brandy; therefore while the number of these establishments is large their aggregate output is small. Molasses as a distiller's material yields nothing but rum, and as the demand for this article is not extensive the molasses stills are relatively unimportant. From other points of view, also, the fruit and molasses concerns are to be examined apart from the grain. The fruit distillers are practically exempt from Government supervision and the proprietors are not kept within narrow bounds by elaborate revenue law restrictions; the easy conditions under which they are permitted to run encourage production in a small way and are responsible for the great number of petty stills; as a natural sequence, fruit distillation is conducted indiscriminately and no efforts are made to regulate it by trade concentration.[2] The molasses distilleries, with but two exceptions, are located in the State of Massachusetts; and since there are only 10 of these distilleries in the country, their common interests are easily adjusted when questions of trade policy arise. Thus the fruit and molasses distilleries stand by themselves; and the present inquiry applies essentially to the grain establishments manufacturing whiskey, alcohol and other articles for which there is widespread demand, and producing more than 96 per cent. of all the ardent spirits.

---

[1] It must be borne in mind, in looking at the figures under the head of fruit distillation, that the liberty allowed to distillers of this class by the Federal laws invites and is naturally attended by frauds on the revenue. Since it is not required that the processes of fruit distillation shall be under the eye of a Government officer, the fruit distiller is able, if so disposed, to understate the amount of his product and thus put on the market a great deal of illicit spirits of which no record appears in the Internal Revenue returns. Indeed, it has been stated and sworn to by the man probably best qualified to speak on the subject, that the fruit distillers systematically pursue the practices hinted at. W. H. Thomas of Louisville, Ky., in testifying before a Congressional Committee in 1888, said: "I handle and sell and am the agent for more apple and peach brandy distillers than any 20 men in the country, and am pretty well posted on the subject. The reason they (the fruit distillers) do not want the bonded period on apple and peach brandy is that the distiller very seldom, if ever, cares for it. When he manufactures his brandy it is worth as much money when it is two months old as when it is two or three years old. . . . He has no storekeeper to watch him. He has got the advantage, which he takes to his own interest, and he *pays the tax on only about one-third of what he makes.*" (Report of the "Whiskey" Investigating Committee of the 50th Congress [1st session], p. 39.) Apparently, therefore, the volume of fruit spirits produced in 1889 was three times as great as the figures above indicate.

[2] More than one-half the fruit spirits produced is distilled in the State of California. The brandy business, like the wine business, is under the general direction and fostering care of the Viticultural Commission in that State. The Eastern fruit distillers, at least in particular States, co-operate more or less harmoniously. But apparently no formal combinations of general scope have been effected.

Here again an understanding of important distinctions is necessary. Grain distillation on a large scale is almost entirely confined to the Northern States and four or five other States lying on the border between North and South. Omitting Kentucky, Missouri, Maryland, Virginia and West Virginia, less than 3 per cent. of the 87,887,456 gallons of tax-paid grain spirits produced in the fiscal year 1888–9 was manufactured in the South; and nearly four-fifths of this 3 per cent. was distilled in Tennessee and North Carolina. This is explained, no doubt, by the fact that the grain used in distillation is nearly all raised in the North, and there are few important grain markets in the South. It is true that there is a considerable number of small grain stills in that section, and probably a larger number of illicit or "moonshine" distilleries; but leaving out the States named, grain distillation is carried on to so limited an extent in the South that the persons engaged in it are hardly taken into account by the "trade" at large, and cut no figure in the great combinations that have been set up.

A very sharp line of trade division separates the representative Northern and Southern distilling interests. In the North, with the exception of some so-called "fine whiskey" made in Pennsylvania and possibly a little manufactured in other States, the entire product is raw alcohol, condensed spirits, etc., which is marketed as soon as produced and used altogether for compounding, adulterating, blending, fortifying and in other ways manipulating beverage spirits and wines, and for mechanical and similar purposes. On the other hand, in the representative distilling States of the South, Kentucky and Maryland—for Missouri, from the distillers' point of view, is counted as a part of the North,—most of the product is bourbon or rye whiskey, which is intended for sale as a high-priced and choice beverage and is generally retained in the bonded warehouses for the full period of three years, in order to give it the ripeness of age, before it is offered for consumption. The grain spirits of the North and South are therefore radically different, and the distinctive product of each section is subject to separate control.

An investigation into the trade affairs of the distillers was undertaken by a Committee of the National House of Representatives in July and August, 1888. The most prominent representatives of the Kentucky and the Northern interests testified. It was shown that the producers of "fine" whiskey in Kentucky had suffered severely from overproduction in certain years and been forced to devise means for regulating the output. The overproduction was especially great in 1881 and 1882, about 32,000,000 gallons of "fine" whiskey having been made in the State in each of those years; whereas, according to the testimony of J. M. Atherton of Louisville, the average yearly demand for Kentucky goods was not in excess of 12,000,000 to 14,000,000 gallons.[1] This immense quantity of "fine" whiskey glutted the market; it could not be sold in the United States, yet, under the Internal Revenue laws, taxes on the whole of it, at the rate of 90 cents per gallon, had to be paid within three years. Relief was sought by exportation. Many millions of gallons were shipped to foreign countries, in the hope that a market could be created there, but nobody would take the American liquor. In 1883 the Kentucky production of "fine" whiskey was only 6,000,000 gallons, and in 1884 7,000,000 gallons; but in 1885, 1886 and 1887 the quantities distilled were, respectively, 10,000,000, 16,000,000 and 16,000,000 gallons. Meanwhile the exported goods were coming back. To put an end to the embarrassment distillers representing 90 per cent. of the producing capacity of Kentucky held a meeting at Louisville on June 9, 1887, and agreed that not a gallon should be manufactured by the establishments represented during the year beginning with July 1, 1887. This had the desired effect, and in that year only 3,500,000 gallons of "fine" whiskey were distilled in the State.[1] The remedy thus applied can be made available in all future emergencies. The Kentucky distillers have discovered the expediency of united action, and are prepared to adopt any measures that will promote the general prosperity and efficiency of their "trade." They hold aloof entirely, however, from the great organization of spirit-distillers at the North, and are not even associated with the producers of so-called "fine" whiskey in Pennsylvania, Maryland and other States. These last-mentioned producers, in turn, apparently have no formal connection with other branches of the "trade"; and, like the spirit-distillers of the South outside of Kentucky, do not seem to operate under any definite limitations. But these comparatively independent "fine" whiskey distillers of Pennsylvania and Maryland produce, in the aggregate, not more than 4,500,000 gallons annually, which is only about 5 per cent. of the whole quantity of grain spirits manufactured in the country.

---

[1] Report of the "Whiskey" Investigation by the House Committee in 1888, p. 4.

As the Kentucky manufacturers represent nearly the entire "fine" whiskey interest, so the Illinois and Ohio distillers represent the great producers of alcohol and raw spirits. In the Northern States (including Missouri and Pennsylvania but not including Maryland), probably from 85 to 90 per cent. of the 55,000,000 or 60,000,000 gallons of grain spirits distilled in that section in the fiscal year 1888–9 was alcohol and crude liquor, not subjected to the "ageing" process but thrust upon the market for immediate consumption. In the Congressional investigation already alluded to it was found that these Northern spirit-distillers, at a meeting held in Chicago on the 10th of May, 1887, had banded themselves into a "trust," known as the Distillers and Cattle-Feeders' Trust, which within a single year's time had become powerful enough to control all but 10 or 15 per cent. of all the spirits (apart from bourbon and rye whiskey) produced in the country—not omitting the South. The following is an extract from the testimony of J. B. Greenhut of Peoria, President of the Trust :[2]

> "*Q.* How much alcohol is made outside of your association in this country ?—*A.* Strictly speaking, of alcohol and spirits I presume probably 10 or 15 per cent.
>
> "*Q.* You embrace all except 10 or 15 per cent. of alcohol as distinguished from whiskey ?—*A.* Well, we also produce whiskey.
>
> "*Q.* A little, not much ?—*A.* Considerable comparatively.
>
> "*Q.* About what per cent. of your total output is whiskey ?—*A.* I should judge about 15 per cent.[3]
>
> "*Q.* Where is the remaining 10 or 15 per cent. [of alcohol, spirits, etc., produced outside the Trust] made ?—*A.* It is scattered ; Chicago, Cincinnati, and some in New York, and in Indiana and Kentucky, and some here and there ; and I think a little of it in Tennessee, and there is a good deal also made that we know nothing of that does not pay the tax—moonshine whiskey."

This Trust, according to President Greenhut, was organized for precisely the same object that the Kentucky distillers had in view when they made their agreement in 1887—to prevent overproduction and bring about intelligent co-operation. In the years 1878–81 there sprang up an extensive demand in foreign countries for American alcohol and spirits ; and to take advantage of the profitable export trade that seemed to be opening up, many new distilleries were built and the producing capacity of the "trade" was increased to great proportions. But in 1882 the German Government passed an act granting a bounty on all spirits exported by German distillers ; and this measure at once ruined the American export business. Then the large spirit-distillers in the United States recognized that combination was advisable in order to diminish the producing capacity, prevent overproduction, maintain prices and insure profits. The various distilling properties were purchased outright by the

---

[1] Ibid, p. 6.

This is Mr. Atherton's estimate ; and the figures for the other years as given above are also Mr. Atherton's. But the Internal Revenue report for 1888 (p. 59) places the product of bourbon and rye whiskey in Kentucky in the fiscal year 1887–8 at 4,643,617 gallons.

[2] Ibid, p. 72.

[3] The "whiskey" produced by the Trust is, however, of the vilest quality. There is no pretense of "ageing" it, in order to eliminate the fusel oil and other impurities, and nearly all of it is practically of no higher grade than raw spirits. For example, more than 3,800,000 gallons produced in Indiana, in the fiscal year 1888–9, is classed by the Internal Revenue report for that year (p. 78) as "whiskey" and "spirits and whiskey ;" but Indiana is not known to the "trade" as one of the States in which any considerable amount of honest whiskey is distilled.

Trust (certificates of stock in the Trust being given to the former owners), and the Trust obtained arbitrary control over each establishment, with power to dictate its production or to suspend it entirely. At the time of the investigation (according to President Greenhut) the capital of the Trust amounted to $30,000,000.[1] In the early part of 1890 the Trust was converted into an incorporated company, under the laws of Illinois, taking the name of the Distilling and Cattle-Feeding Company. This change was deemed prudent as a means of protecting the organization from possible anti-trust legislation or judicial decisions. Its power has steadily increased, and apparently it is now able, if it chooses to do so, to control the manufacture, the price and the sale of every gallon of grain spirits, excepting the so-called "fine" whiskey.

The federation and concentration of the brewers, distillers and wine-makers is the chief source not only of the traffic's national wealth and power but of nearly all the separate elements of its activity and influence. From the facts already stated the first part of this conclusion may indeed be taken for granted; for it is needless to demonstrate the proposition that for acquisitive purposes riches can be most effectively utilized when invested co-operatively and wielded by a few chosen executives, or that for objects of aggression and defense the degree of co-operation determines the degree of strategic advantage. And in a more detailed survey of the organized strength of the liquor "trade" at large the prestige of the manufacturers is the most conspicuous thing.

There are two great organizations that act politically and represent the "trade" throughout the country in a comprehensive manner—the United States Brewers' Association, which has been noticed above, and the National Protective Association. The latter was founded at a convention held in Chicago, Oct. 18 and 19, 1886, at the instance of distillers, brewers and wholesale liquor-dealers. Its special mission is to raise funds by assessments upon members, which are wholly used for counteracting the Prohibitory movement. It is supported mainly by the distillers and their agents, the wholesale whiskey-sellers; a distiller is at its head and its headquarters are in Louisville, one of the most important distillers' centers. A third national organization, also controlled by the distillers and wholesalers, is the Wine and Spirit Traders' Society, with headquarters in New York. The results of its political work have not been frequently shown, but its power was indicated by the alacrity with which Congress submitted to its dictation when the McKinley tariff rates of 1890 were fixed. (See United States Government and the Liquor Traffic.) Even among the liquor organizations in the separate States the manufacturers' societies are frequently the strongest and most energetic. There are compact organizations of brewers in a number of States, notably New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Ohio. In Prohibitory Amendment campaigns the brewers, through State associations, have often constituted the chief factor of the opposition.

Retailers.—The retail traffic is everywhere organized, but in most instances for local and immediate purposes only. Almost without exception the saloon-keepers are ignorant and brutal individuals, and their trade policy resembles that pursued by criminal bands. They are forever at war with the restrictions of the law and the opinion of the moral and religious public; and the value of their organized efforts, from a general pro-liquor point of view, lies in their ability, locally, to perform all conceivable dirty work with success—to defy restrictive laws and make them ridiculous, to sell the maximum quantity of liquor, to take the leadership of the desperate, corrupt and criminal classes of voters, to manipulate primaries and conventions, to defeat good and elect bad candidates for office, and, to compel the police and other authorities to disregard their duties and their oaths. While the retailers are very active and powerful in local affairs their open interference in larger fields is discouraged by all the discriminating persons interested, because it is not desirable to have the traffic formally represented by ruffians, blackguards and illiterates. On the other hand the saloon-keepers bear themselves with a certain conceit and insist upon instituting State associations, which inveigh against Prohibition and restriction, scurrilously attack honest men and good women, broadly hint at the successful use of corrupt methods in Legislatures and elections and in other ways forcibly call attention to the worst aspects of the liquor cause.

---

[1] Ibid, p. 64.

But the retailers also are feeling the discipline of concentration. High License is reducing their numbers, eliminating the indiscreet and irresponsible rumsellers and bringing the saloon business as a whole under systematic management. Since practical experiments have shown that this policy promotes the general welfare of the traffic without diminishing the consumption of liquor or disturbing the characteristic methods and influence of the dealers, the entrenchment movement is resisted only by the short-sighted. In forecasting the ultimate development of present tendencies it is hardly needful to take into account the preferences of the retailers as a class. Even now they are not an independent element. In most of the great cities the majority of them operate as agents of the brewers, who select or approve the premises, procure the licenses, advance the requisite capital in whole or in part, and secure themselves by chattel mortgages. W. J. Onahan, City Collector of Chicago, in January, 1888, declared that not less than 80 per cent. of the saloons in that city were owned by or mortgaged to the brewers. In New York City an examination of the records showed that during the eight weeks from March 10 to April 25, 1888, mortgages or renewals of mortgages on 497 saloons were executed in favor of 43 brewing firms, the aggregate value of the mortgages and renewals being $404,932.[1] The mortgaged saloons, or "tied houses," represent a considerable part of the investment of each brewer, and their chief business object is to sell and advertise the beer of the particular brewery to which they are bound. Frequently the signs displayed in front of licensed premises announce the name of the brewing establishment in large characters, but do not show the name of the saloon-keeper. The prevalence of this system is another evidence of the concentration that the whole traffic has undergone.

General Conclusions.—As effect follows cause, temperance success is made more difficult by the conditions which we have reviewed. A fight with a single saloon means a fight with a combination of saloons and with the brewer and wholesaler whose interests are involved; a general conflict with the retail traffic in city, county or State, means a conflict with all the local societies and also (if the issues at stake are important) with great national organizations which are always ready for battle and can compel enormous campaign contributions with perfect ease. Yet it must be remembered that when the existence of a long-established institution is threatened a solid confederation of its defenders is inevitable; and that the sooner such a confederation is effected the sooner will all the conditions of warfare be understood, the preliminary results be reckoned at their correct worth and the decisive operations be inaugurated. Therefore if the aggressors aim to definitely overthrow rather than to harrass the enemy, there are compensations for any prejudicial consequences inflicted by vigorous resistance: the issues are drawn so that none can mistake them, the co-operation of hitherto indifferent forces is gained, the merits of the cause receive more serious consideration from the public at large and the ground subsequently won will be more secure.

RESOURCES AND NUMBERS—THE RUM POWER.

Capital Invested.—The total capital invested in the various departments of the traffic cannot be satisfactorily reckoned. According to the Census of 1880[2] there were invested in the manufacturing branches in that year the following amounts: Malt liquors, $91,208,224; distilled liquors, $24,247,595; vinous liquors, $2,581,910. We have seen that in December, 1890, 82 breweries which had recently been consolidated had a stated capitalization of more than $81,000,000; while several of the greatest breweries, with more than 1,850 others, were not included in this number. We have also seen that, on the testimony of the President of the Distillers and Cattle-Feeders' Trust, the capital stock of that organization was $30,000,000 in 1888, and that this sum represented none of the capital invested in distilleries in the South, or in the "fine" whiskey business in Pennsylvania or other Northern States, or in the molasses distilleries, or in the more than 3,000 fruit distilleries. Manifestly, therefore, it must be concluded (1) that the Census figures of 1880 were very much too low,[1] or (2) that the capital of the brewers and distillers has been vastly increased since that year, or (3) that the English syndicates and Whiskey Trust have been over-capitalized or "stock-watered" to a great extent. It is quite certain that all these conclusions are to be accepted. The reasonableness of the first is shown by the fact that the 82 syndicated breweries, capitalized at $81,000,000 in 1890, produced only 4,461,177 barrels,[2] or something more than one-third as much as the total beer output of 1880; and it is not conceivable that the brewers of the country were able to manufacture nearly three times as much beer with only $91,000,000 in 1880 as 82 brewers produced with $81,000,000 in 1890—even making very generous allowances for a smaller percentage of watered stock in 1880 than in 1890. But it is undoubted that there has been a heavy increase in invested capital in the 10 years; this is shown by the doubled production of beer and the development of the wine interest,[3] not to speak of the capital specially attracted by the new movements that we have outlined. In the brewing business alone, if the capital has increased in proportion to the production, the amount now invested should be about $180,000,000; but it is unsafe to make this assumption.

---

[1] Political Prohibitionist for 1888, p. 159.

[2] Application was made by the editor of this Cyclopædia to the Superintendent of the 11th Census for estimates of the amounts of capital invested in liquor manufacture in 1890; but a communication from the Census office, received just before this part of the book was given to the printer, stated that the data then in hand were not sufficient to justify the desired estimates.

---

[1] It is generally recognized by statisticians that the estimates in the Census for 1880 of capital invested in manufacturing interests are conservative, including paid-up capital only. Besides, the Census Bureau disregards capital invested in many small establishments. For example, the Census estimate of $24,247,595 invested in the manufacture of distilled liquors represented only 844 distilling establishments ("Compendium of the 10th Census," p. 938); yet the Internal Revenue records show that 4,661 distilleries were operated in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1880.

Indeed, the unsatisfactoriness of the Census statistics of capital invested is frankly admitted by Francis A. Walker, Superintendent, who says ("10th Census of the United States," vol. 2, p. xxxix):

"The statistics of capital invested in manufacture, as obtained by a popular canvass, in which the statements of individual proprietors are necessarily accepted, and, indeed, are by the law intended to be accepted, are always likely to be partial and defective, far beyond the limit of error which pertains to other classes of statistics derived from the manufacturing schedule. . . . When the Committee of Congress was in 1869 engaged in preparing a bill providing for the taking of the 9th Census, the present writer [Francis A. Walker] addressed to that Committee a recommendation that the inquiry regarding the amount of capital invested be omitted from the manufacturing schedule; and . . . in commenting . . . used the following language (see volume on 'Industry and Wealth,' 9th Census, pp. 381–2): 'The Census returns of capital invested in manufactures are entirely untrustworthy and delusive. The inquiry is one of which it is not too much to say that it ought never to be embraced in the schedules of the Census, not merely for the reason that the results are and must remain wholly worthless, . . . but also because the inquiry in respect to capital creates more prejudice and arouses more opposition . . . than all the other inquiries. . . . Manufacturers resent [it] as needlessly obstrusive, . . . and the majority of them could not answer to their own satisfaction even if disposed. No man in business knows what he is worth—far less can say what portion of his estate is to be treated as capital. With . . . corporations, having a determinate capital stock, the difficulty . . . becomes very much reduced; yet . . . the difference caused by returning such capital stock at its nominal value on the one hand, or its actual selling-price on the other, whether above or below par, might easily make a difference of 50 to 75 per cent. in the aggregate amount of capital stated for any branch of industry. Where . . . business is carried on outside of incorporated companies, the difficulty of obtaining even an approximate return of the capital, . . . irrespective of the reluctance of manufacturers, becomes such as to render success hopeless. So numerous are the constructions, possible and even reasonable, in respect to what constitutes manufacturing capital, that anything like harmony or consistency of treatment is not to be expected of a large body of officials pursuing their work independently of each other. The Superintendent is free to confess that he would be puzzled to furnish a definition (fit for practical use by enumerators) of manufacturing capital, or, even in a single case, with complete access to the books of a manufacturing establishment conducted by two or more partners and with the frankest exhibit of the assets, both of the firm and of the individuals thereof, to make up a statement of the capital of the concern in respect to which he would feel any assurance. When to such difficulties in the nature of the subject is added the reluctance of manufacturers to answer an inquiry of this character, it may fairly be assumed in advance of any enumerations that the result will be of the slightest possible value.'

"A host of illustrations might be offered. . . . Here are two shoe factories in the same town, each employing 200 workmen. In one case the manufacturer owns the building in which his operations are carried on, and reports his capital $75,000, being the value of his stock and machinery plus the value of the building; the other reports his capital $25,000, being the value of stock and machinery only. The latter would not and could not rightfully report the value of the building as a part of his capital. . . . Yet that building is devoted to manufacturing uses, and any summary of the manufacturing capital of the country which omits consideration of it is, in so far, defective. . . . A very large part of the manufacturing establishments of a city like New York or Philadelphia are located in leased buildings. . . . The value of utilized water-powers . . . must amount to a vast sum, . . . being the property of water-power companies or of the individual owners of adjacent lands. . . . Take still another large class of cases. A manufacturer has habitually $50,000 worth of his paper discounted by one, two, or three banks. . . . He cannot return this. . . . It is not his manufacturing capital, for the best reason in the world, viz., that it is not his property at all—it is the capital of the banks or of his individual creditors. . . . Yet many hundreds of millions of dollars of borrowed capital are habitually employed in prosecuting the manufacturing enterprises of the country."

[2] *Brewers' Journal*, Dec. 1, 1890.

[3] According to an article appearing in the New York *Sun* for Oct. 26, 1890, which (it was claimed) was based on information furnished by Mr. Gardner, Special Agent of the Census office for the collection of statistics relating to viticulture, the amount of capital now invested in vineyards and wine-cellars in the United States is in excess of $155,000,000. This large estimate, taken in connection with the figures above presented, is another illustration of the great embarrassments encountered in such an investigation as the present one.

All that can with certainty be said is that the aggregate amount of liquor-manufacturers' capital ($118,037,729) given in the Census for 1880 was very much below the actual amount for that year; and that no estimate of the present amount is likely to be excessive if so calculated as to avoid, on the one hand, the disposition to obtain a total not considerably above the Census figures, and on the other the danger of unreasonably approximating a total that would be in proportion to the foregoing figures of English syndicate capitalization.

It is even more difficult to estimate the sums invested in the wholesale and retail departments. The most that can be done is to state the number of persons engaged, and leave it to the reader to determine the probable average investment. In the fiscal year 1888–9 there were, according to the Internal Revenue report, 6,907 wholesale and 171,669 retail dealers in malt and distilled liquors—a total of 178,576. Many of these were druggists, others were hotel-owners and others were not lawfully engaged in the traffic under State regulations. But taking these facts and others into account it is probably a fair supposition that this number represents not less than 165,000 establishments devoted, practically, to the exclusive sale of liquor at wholesale or retail, and based on tolerably solid trade foundations. If it is assumed that the average investment per liquor-dealer is $2,000, the aggregate capital is, therefore, $320,000,000; if $4,000, $640,000,000, etc.

There is another means of indicating the magnitude of the wealth invested. The total annual gross receipts of the retailers from the consumers have been conservatively calculated at $1,000,000,000. (See COST OF THE DRINK TRAFFIC.) It may be supposed that the investment necessary to produce such an income is of course much smaller in the retail liquor business than in most other lines of trade, since the profits are far larger and are won without special effort; but when it is remembered that the hazards involved are greater, that rents and insurance come higher, that license fees averaging perhaps not less than $250 per year must be paid by each dealer, etc., it will be understood that the volume of the capital must be enormous, even when measured with the gross receipts. Indeed, knowing the amount that the traffic draws from the people annually, it is unnecessary as it is fruitless to strive for a precise answer to the question, How much is invested? Each year the tremendous sum of a thousand millions, freshly obtained from the people, is handled by the liquor-dealers, while incalculable hundreds of millions of accumulated resources are held by them in reserve.[1]

Resources of the Liquor Organizations.—Upon this vast wealth the leaders of the traffic have power to levy indefinitely for political and defensive purposes, and there are numerous evidences that the power is constantly exercised. The great national organizations, the United States Brewers' Association and the National Protective Association, are able to raise large sums at short notice. The brewers are so well organized in the separate States that their National Association apparently does not address itself to detail work, but stands ready to perform any national or special service that may be required. Thus, in 1887 it paid to two lawyers the princely fee of $16,000 for writing briefs in a single anti-Prohibition case (see p. 92), and donated $13,000 to liquor managers in Amendment campaigns. Apart from extra assessments it has a regular annual income of more than $50,000, raised by a tax of 20 cents on each 100 barrels of beer manufactured, and by requiring each associate member to pay annual dues of $40.[2] The National Protective Association is incessantly engaged in anti-Prohibition agitation. Its regular funds are provided by yearly assessments of $25 to $1,000 on distillers and wholesalers, the amount paid by each to be in proportion to the business done during the year.[1] But the money thus obtained is only a part of its resources; additional sums are secured by systematic solicitation when campaigns are on.

---

[1] There is also a very considerable amount of capital invested by dealers illicitly or transiently engaged in the traffic, and by persons in various pursuits—coopers, hotel-proprietors, hop-growers, maltsters (see MALT), ice-dealers, manufacturers of distilling and brewing apparatus, bottlers, etc.,—whose prosperity is associated with that of the drink-producers and sellers. This allied capital must be reckoned in taking a general view of the traffic's resources.

[2] The Brewers' Association, previously to 1890, assessed its members only 10 cents per 100 barrels, and charged only $20 for annual dues. These rates were doubled in 1890, and this of course doubled the regular annual income. (See "Report of the Thirtieth Brewers' Convention," p. 45.)

Secrecy is one of the essential rules of conduct of all the liquor organizations, but the enormous amounts which they expend in political and legislative machinations and to defeat Prohibition are indicated by much testimony besides that cited above. It is known that in the Amendment campaign in Pennsylvania, in 1889, $200,000 was contributed in the city of Philadelphia alone, while a single wholesale liquor firm advanced $38,000; and the Philadelphia *Press* estimated that in the whole State the subscriptions aggregated $1,000,000, and additional amounts were raised outside the State, including $100,000 from the New York brewers and large donations from the National Protective Association. (See pp. 121–2.) By direct testimony from the liquor campaign managers it has been ascertained that in the Rhode Island contest of 1889 $31,000 was paid for the single object of manipulating the newspapers, and $6,000 was given for the services of a single politician (see pp. 125–6); and that in Nebraska in 1890 $25,000 was furnished by a few brewers and probably an equal amount by the Executive Board of the Whiskey Trust.[2] It is notorious that the payments made by the liquor-sellers to the campaign leaders of both the leading political parties are steady and heavy. In the Presidential fight of 1888 it was charged that the National Committee of one of the parties received $200,000 from the Whiskey Trust, donated because of a discrimination in favor of small distillers embraced in a revenue bill championed in Congress by the opposing party; and that the same Committee obtained generous sums from the brewers in consideration of the pledge of its Chairman to defeat Prohibition in Pennsylvania in 1889.

It is impossible to touch this subject of the means at the command of Prohibition's organized opponents without speedily becoming convinced that they are practically identical with the surplus resources of the traffic. There have even been cases of resistance so zealous as to bankrupt the persons engaged in it.[3]

Numerical Strength.—The following table, compiled from the Internal Revenue reports, shows the numbers of distilleries and breweries operated in the United States each year since 1872:

Fiscal Years Ending June 30.	Distilleries Operated.[1]	Breweries.
1872	3,132	3,421
1873	7,504	3.554
1874	3,506	2,524
1875	4,608	2,783
1876	2,918	3,293
1877	4,510	2,758
1878	5,652	2,830
1879	5,346	2,719
1880	4,661	2,741
1881	5,210	2,474
1882	5,022	2,371
1883	5,129	2,378
1884	4,738	2,240
1885	5,172	2,230
1886	6,034	2,292
1887	4,905	2,269
1888	3,646	1,968
1889	4,349	1,964

[1] To avoid confusion, the reader should bear in mind that not all of these distillers are included in the tables of persons paying United States special liquor taxes. Distillers as such do not pay special taxes; only those distillers who are also engaged in rectifying (as defined in § 3244 of c. 3 of the Internal Revenue laws for 1889) are so taxed. Thus, although there were 4,349 distilleries operated in 1889, the Internal Revenue returns show that only 1,243 persons paid the rectifier's special tax in that year. This distinction does not apply to brewers, wholesale liquor-dealers or retail liquor-dealers—all of whom pay special taxes. But the distinction as to distillers must be remembered by all who may have occasion to compare the figures given above with those appearing in the original Internal Revenue tables of special tax-payers—these tables being commonly (but erroneously) regarded as embracing all manufacturers of and dealers in distilled and malt liquors.

In the following table are shown the numbers of distilleries operated, by States and Territories, for the three years 1872, 1880 and 1889:

States and Territories.	1872.	1880.	1889.
Alabama	68	24	64
Arizona	..	...	...
Arkansas	22	20	85
California	262	212	262
Colorado	...	1	...
Connecticut	55	97	53
Dakota	...	...	...
Delaware	13	87	...
District of Columbia	...	...	...
Florida	...	...	...
Georgia	646	287	177

---

[1] Wholesale dealers: those doing a yearly business of less than $200,000, $25; those doing a business of $200,000 to $500,000, $100; those doing a business of $500,000 to $1,000,000, $300; those doing a business of more than $1,000,000, $500. Distilleries (whether running or not): those with a mashing capacity of 100 bushels, $100; 200 to 300 bushels, $200; 300 to 400 bushels, $400; 500 to 600 bushels, $500; 600 to 700 bushels, $600; 700 to 800 bushels, $700; 800 to 900 bushels, $800; 900 to 1,000 bushels, $900; over 1,000 bushels, $1,000.—*Political Prohibitionist for* 1888, *p.* 25.

[2] See confidential letters from George L. Miller of Omaha, Neb., and J. B. Greenhut, President of the Distilling and Cattle-Feeding Company, in the *Voice* for Oct. 2, 9 and 16, 1890.

[3] Notably the case of John Walruff, a brewer at Lawrence, Kan., who spent his entire fortune in vainly fighting the Kansas Prohibitory law.

STATES AND TERRITORIES.	1872.	1880.	1889.
Idaho	1	1	...
Illinois	98	54	38
Indiana	121	79	67
Iowa	18	13	3
Kansas	2	4	1
Kentucky	237	570	584
Louisiana	3	2	12
Maine	1	...	...
Maryland	28	22	62
Massachusetts	28	26	15
Michigan	1	...	...
Minnesota	...	1	2
Mississippi	43	3	...
Missouri	91	81	79
Montana	...	...	...
Nebraska	...	1	1
Nevada	...	...	...
New Hampshire	3	1	2
New Jersey	116	110	72
New Mexico	2	5	5
New York	92	40	58
North Carolina	166	1,284	1,333
Ohio	110	87	68
Oregon	6	9	11
Pennsylvania	86	96	116
Rhode Island	1	...	...
South Carolina	102	40	29
Tennessee	246	262	316
Texas	29	12	25
Utah	...	...	...
Vermont	5	9	...
Virginia	342	1,002	769
Washington	...	...	...
West Virginia	78	113	36
Wisconsin	10	6	6
Wyoming	...	...	...
Totals	3,132	4,661	4,349

Below are given the numbers of breweries, by States and Territories, for the same years:

STATES AND TERRITORIES.	1872.	1880.	1889.
Alabama	5	1	3
Arizona	10	15	..[2]
Arkansas	1	..	..
California	226	223	196[3]
Colorado	36	36	26[4]
Connecticut	25	20	25[5]
Dakota	6	19	..[6]
Delaware	2	7	..[7]
District of Columbia	15	..[1]	..
Florida	2	..	..
Georgia	4	2	2
Idaho	12	11	..[8]
Illinois	216	130	108
Indiana	169	96	44
Iowa	171	139	41
Kansas	46	39	4[9]
Kentucky	46	42	37
Louisiana	16	11	10[10]
Maine	1	..	..[11]
Maryland	72	73	56[12]
Massachusetts	56	37	24
Michigan	189	141	128
Minnesota	114	132	99
Mississippi	2	..	..[13]
Missouri	124	88	49
Montana	36	24	46[14]
Nebraska	23	24	42[15]
Nevada	41	35	..[16]
New Hampshire	5	6	6[17]
New Jersey	83	58	40
New Mexico	8	3	14[18]
New York	479	387	285
North Carolina	1	2	..
Ohio	288	214	140
Oregon	31	32	77[19]
Pennsylvania	443	372	268
Rhode Island	4	7	..[20]
South Carolina	2	4	2
Tennessee	11	4	3
Texas	44	28	8
Utah	16	17	..[21]
Vermont	4	..	..[22]
Virginia	13	3	2
Washington	14	15	..[23]
West Virginia	17	12	3
Wisconsin	292	223	176
Wyoming	..	9	..[24]
Totals	3,421	2,741	1,964

[1] Since Oct. 2, 1876, the District of Columbia has been part of the third district of Maryland. [2] See New Mexico above. [3] Including Nevada. [4] Including Wyoming. [5] Including Rhode Island. [6] See Nebraska above. [7] See Maryland above. [8] See Montana above. [9] Including Indian Territory. [10] Including Mississippi. [11] See New Hampshire above. [12] Including Delaware, Dist. of Columbia and two counties of Virginia. [13] See Louisiana above. [14] Including Idaho and Utah. [15] Including Dakota. [16] See California above. [17] Including Maine and Vermont. [18] Including Arizona. [19] Including Alaska and Washington. [20] See Connecticut above. [21] See Montana above. [22] See New Hampshire above. [23] See Oregon above. [24] See Colorado above.

The Internal Revenue reports of wholesale and retail liquor-dealers are, for several reasons, not conclusive. Every person paying the United States special tax on wholesale and retail liquor-dealers, whether regularly engaged in the liquor traffic or not, and whether selling for a whole year or for but a single month, week or day, is counted in these reports. This fact should not be overlooked in analyzing the figures that follow.

Previously to 1878 the numbers of wholesale and retail dealers were not specified in the Internal Revenue records. For that year and the succeeding years the numbers, as indicated by the records, were:[1]

FISCAL YEARS Ending June 30.	WHOLESALE DEALERS.	RETAIL DEALERS.
1878	5,632	165,804
1879	5,400	165,338
1880	5,855	173,400
1881	6,146	179,176
1882	6,427	176,776
1883	7,229	195,869
1884	6,996	188,288
1885	6,904	190,994
1886	7,302	198,530
1887	7,550	196,792
1888	7,185	176,748
1889	6,907	171,669

The numbers of wholesale and retail dealers, by States and Territories, for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1878 and June 30, 1889, are given below:

---

[1] In the Internal Revenue reports the different kinds of dealers are classified as "Wholesale Liquor-Dealers" (meaning those dealing in distilled liquors), "Wholesale Dealers in Malt Liquors" (meaning those not dealing in distilled liquors), "Retail Liquor-Dealers" and "Retail Dealers in Malt Liquors." We have combined both classes of wholesale and retail dealers under the respective heads, so that our lists of wholesale and retail dealers include all wholesalers and all retailers.

STATES AND TERRITORIES.	WHOLESALE DEALERS.		RETAIL DEALERS.	
	1878.	1889.	1878.	1889.
Alabama	53	46	1,720	879
Arizona[1]	21	..	403	....
Arkansas	43	41	1,423	811
California[2]	292	512	8,785	13,029
Colorado[3]	55	109	904	2,623
Connecticut[4]	104	209	2,799	4,340
Dakota[5]	23	....	608	....
Delaware[6]	14	....	625	....
District of Columbia[7]	..	....	....	....
Florida	11	20	513	352
Georgia	85	75	2,300	1,610
Idaho[8]	9	....	215	....
Illinois	334	442	11,123	12,278
Indiana	125	167	4,837	6,214
Iowa	114	85	4,350	2,981
Kansas[9]	44	28	1,082	1,350
Kentucky	254	220	3,963	3,308
Louisiana[10]	192	176	3,506	5,679
Maine[11]	13	....	487	....
Maryland[12]	217	183	4,887	6,223
Massachusetts	296	353	6,775	5,482
Michigan	118	174	5,095	6,056
Minnesota	67	140	2,203	2,749
Mississippi[13]	62	....	1,776	....
Missouri	261	271	6,082	5,709
Montana[14]	42	92	429	2,151
Nebraska[15]	46	173	1,001	3,534
Nevada[16]	23	....	989	....
New Hampshire[17]	32	61	928	2,326
New Jersey	85	255	6,259	6,846
New Mexico[18]	21	66	406	1,401
New York	942	1,279	28,149	33,287
North Carolina	44	33	1,779	1.273
Ohio	446	541	13.379	12,230
Oregon[19]	19	66	934	1,992
Pennsylvania	502	555	16,190	9,968
Rhode Island[20]	67	....	1,410	....
South Carolina	38	17	1,237	826
Tennessee	125	69	3,104	1,659
Texas	164	217	3,704	3,318
Utah[21]	19	....	361	....
Vermont[22]	6	....	444	....
Virginia	79	57	2,384	2,211
Washington[23]	11	....	292	....
West Virginia	19	8	731	619
Wisconsin	97	167	4,964	6,355
Wyoming[24]	7	....	269	....
Totals	5,632	6,907	165,804	171,669

[1] See New Mexico above. [2] Including Nevada from Oct. 1, 1883 to July 31, 1884, and since July 1, 1887. [3] Including Wyoming since Aug. 15, 1883. [4] Including Rhode Island since July 1, 1887. [5] See Nebraska above. [6] Including 9 counties of Maryland from Oct. 2, 1876 to June 30, 1887, two counties of Virginia from June 19, 1877 to June 30, 1887, and part of the collection district of Maryland since July 1, 1887. [7] See Maryland above. [8] See Montana above. [9] Including Indian Territory since Aug. 8, 1881. [10] Including Mississippi since July 1, 1887. [11] See New Hampshire above. [12] Including District of Columbia from Oct. 2, 1876 to June 30, 1887, and States of Maryland and Delaware and District of Columbia since July 1, 1887. [13] See Louisiana above. [14] Including Idaho since Aug. 20, 1883, and Utah from Aug. 20, 1883 to July 31, 1884, and since July 1, 1887. [15] Including Dakota since Aug. 20, 1883. [16] Including Utah from Aug. 1, 1884 to June 30, 1887; see California above. [17] Including Maine and Vermont since July 1, 1887. [18] Including Arizona since Sept. 5, 1883. [19] Including Alaska since Dec. 27, 1872, and Washington Territory since Sept. 1, 1883. [20] See Connecticut above. [21] See Montana and Nevada above. [22] See New Hampshire above. [23] See Oregon above. [24] See Colorado above.

From these statistics it appears that the number of establishments manufacturing or selling liquors (exclusive of those in which only vinous liquors were made or vended) increased from 179,918 in 1878 to 214,158 in 1886, and that since 1886 there was an annual decrease, the number having fallen to 184,889[1] in 1889—a decrease of nearly 30,000 in three years. We have already pointed out that many who pay United States special taxes as wholesale and retail liquor-dealers are not to be regarded as rumsellers proper. Making allowance for this fact it is probable that the whole number of places in which the wholesaling or retailing of liquors is carried on constantly and as the sole or chief feature of the business, may now fairly be estimated at about 165,000; and counting distillers and brewers, the number of manufacturing, wholesale and retail liquor establishments (distilled and malt) is therefore something in excess of 170,000. On the basis of this total the number of persons engaged as proprietors, active or silent (including those handling vinous liquors only), cannot reasonably be reckoned at less than 250,000.

These 250,000 proprietors constitute the chief division of the "rum power." But there are other divisions even more formidable numerically. The first is made up of employes of the traffic. According to the Census returns, there were employed in the three manufacturing branches 33,234 males over 16 years of age in the year 1880; but since the number of liquor-manufacturing establishments included in the Census records for that year was very much less than the actual number, and since the volume of the brewing business has doubled in the last 10 years, it is probable that not fewer than 50,000 adult males (exclusive of proprietors) are now employed in liquor production. There are no reliable statistics of persons employed in the wholesale and retail departments; but it is undoubtedly fair to assign at least three employes to each two wholesale and retail concerns, making 247,500 employes if the aggregate number of wholesale and retail establishments is placed at the low figure of 165,000. Besides proprietors and employes, there is a large element made up of saloon dependents, relatives of manufacturers and dealers, individuals engaged in allied trades, etc., whose personal interests are scarcely less actively enlisted in defense of the traffic than those of the classes already mentioned. In view of the peculiarly strong influence exerted by the men engaged in the liquor business, few will dispute the conclusion that for each one of the 170,000 liquor establishments there are at least five men (besides proprietors and employes) whose opinions and votes, so far as the temperance issue is concerned, are absolutely at the disposal of the liquor-traffickers—making 850,000 in all. The following recapitulation shows the approximate total numerical strength of the "rum power" if the foregoing calculations are worthy of acceptance:

---

[1] These totals are at variance with the footings of the tables of United States special tax-payers. For explanations, see the note to the table, p. 382, col. 2.

Proprietors	250,000
Employes (manufacturing)	50,000
Employes (wholesale and retail)	247,500
Dependents of the traffic, etc	850,000
Total	1,397,500

Our estimates represent males and voters only. The entire popular vote of the United States in 1888 (including Territories) was about 11,700,000; so that the rum power constitutes nearly 12 per cent. of the entire electorate. This is a most formidable balance of power, and its importance is increased when its distribution is analyzed. The pivotal State of the Union, politically, is New York, which contains about 35,000 special liquor tax-payers; and if no more than five votes (including proprietors and employes) are represented by each special tax payment, the voting strength of the liquor traffic in this one State is 175,000, or more than 13 per cent., without taking into account the numerous voters whose hostility to Prohibition arises from other causes than personal identification or direct association with the traffic.

ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL RELATIONS.

The value to mankind of the vast wealth and strength of this traffic, and the influence exercised upon the varied interests of civilization, are to be estimated, as in the case of any industry or craft, by a dispassionate inspection of its fruits.

The claim is no longer made by intelligent persons that alcohol in any of its beverage forms is indispensable to man in the broad sense that food, clothing, habitation, etc., are indispensable. Even if it is conceded (and the temperance advocates are by no means willing to make such a concession) that alcohol is to a certain limited extent indispensable for medicinal and similar restricted purposes, it is manifest that there is no actual necessity for a large production of beverage liquors or for a liquor traffic of any considerable importance. The most favorable view of the drink business in its present state of development is, therefore, that it exists to supply a luxury. But when it is remembered that the characteristic results of this business are vice, crime, impoverishment, insanity, and misery in all its forms, its place in the economic scale is clearly not with those luxury-supplying industries that minister peculiarly to refinement and elegance, but with those abhorrent trades (like prostitution and gambling) that prey upon the innocence, weakness and folly of humanity. If exceptionally, or even in many instances, the use of liquor is not conspicuously injurious, or indeed may be thought promotive of pleasure and sociability, this fact does not call for a modification of the severity with which the general liquor traffic is viewed by moralists. The most prominent of living American apologists for conservative or "expedient" liquor legislation has frankly declared that the saloon is "evil, and only evil, and that continually;"[1] and it is in vain to seek for a serious contradiction of this opinion from any disinterested person whose views deserve citation.

Necessarily the traffic pays a price for its existence; and it remains to be determined whether this price so far compensates the community for the evils wrought as to neutralize the objections that are urged against the business. Conclusions may be reached, first, by logically reviewing the general questions involved from the standpoint of morals and public policy; and second, by reckoning, from available statistics, the comparative money value of the contributions made by the traffic to the community. The outlines of the logical argument are presented in various articles in this work, especially in ETHICS OF LICENSE, LICENSE, PERSONAL LIBERTY, and LOGIC, LIQUOR. The chief statistical facts are examined in the articles on COST OF THE DRINK TRAFFIC and FARMERS; but there is one factor not yet considered—the recompense that the traffic gives to labor and to various industries (apart from agriculture) for services performed, material furnished, etc.

---

[1] Dr. Howard Crosby, in a speech in Brooklyn, N. Y., Feb. 3, 1887. (See the *Voice*, Feb. 10, 1887.)

Labor Employed by the Liquor Traffic.—An immoral and damaging trade cannot be economically defended on the ground that it employs labor and to some extent enlarges the market for useful products. The questions inevitably arise, Does not such a trade, by reason of its demoralizing and damaging effects, prevent to a greater extent than it promotes the employment of labor? Does it not injure or ruin more men than it benefits? Does it not restrict more than it enlarges the market for necessaries and comforts? Does it not interfere with more than it stimulates consumption? Even if the wages paid to labor and the volume of the business transacted with other industries are up to or above the average the general judgment upon such a trade must be made up without regard to any favorable reputation that it may have from this point of view.

But the liquor traffic notoriously gives to labor smaller rewards, on the basis of the capital invested, than are bestowed in other lines of trade. Taking its three manufacturing branches (malt, distilled and vinous), we have seen that in the 3,152 establishments represented in the Census of 1880, the capital invested (according to the Census estimates), amounted to $118,037,729, while the average number of hands employed (adult males, females and minors) was 33,689 and the wages paid for the year 1880 aggregated $15,078,579. Although the Census data under this head were not complete, the returns for the liquor establishments represented were probably as nearly accurate (so far as the ratios existing between capital invested, laborers employed and wages paid are concerned) as those given in the Census for most other manufacturing industries. In so broad an inquiry as that conducted by the Census Bureau, it may be assumed that the proportion of errors in the estimates for one department of manufacture is no greater than in those for other separate departments. On the basis of the above figures, an investment of $3,504 of capital in liquor manufacture employs one man one year and pays him in wages $448. Taking the statistics for several other leading manufacturing industries appearing in the Census for 1880, the following comparisons are obtained:[1]

INDUSTRY.	CAPITAL.	PERSONS EMPLOYED (One Year).	WAGES PAID (One Year).
Liquors	$3,504 Invested.	1	$448
Boots and Shoes		8.6	3,287
Furniture[1]		4.6	1,847
Carpentering		9.7	4,408
Brick and Tile		8.4	1,702
Carpets[2]		3.4	1,135
Cotton Goods		3.	728
Woolen Goods		3.2	942
Sewing Machines and Attachments		2.7	1,299
Printing and Publishing		3.3	1,699
Worsted Goods		3.2	977
Agricultural Implements		2.2	867

[1] Including Furniture (Chairs). [2] Including Carpets (Rag) and Carpets (Wood).

The $118,037,729 of capital which, invested in liquor manufacture, gave employment to 33,689 persons and paid them $15,078,579 in wages, would, if invested in the other 11 industries specified above, have employed 134,833 persons and paid them in wages $45,499,595—reckoning on the basis of the Census returns for 1880.

There are no statistics from which to compare the number of laborers employed and the wages paid in the wholesale and retail liquor traffic and in other branches of wholesale and retail trade. But it is not probable that the share given to labor by the liquor-dealers is proportionately more generous than that given by the liquor-manufacturers. It is notorious that very little labor is required in the ordinary liquor-shop. And there are but few who will claim that the demand for labor which is to be credited to the rumsellers is a wholesome demand or beneficial in any sense to the general interests of labor. The name of bartender is odious to all reputable workingmen; and the most extensive secret organization of wage-workers ever founded in the United States has refused to recognize bartenders as worthy of fellowship with its members.

Aside from and above all other reasons, the liquor traffic is economically condemned because of its hurtfulness to the community on grounds of public policy. It is regarded by all as the chief promoter of corruption, crime and rascality in politics, and of wicked and discreditable government. Any trade whose existence is in jeopardy will naturally acquire political prominence. If the trade in question is a thoroughly bad one from the moral point of view, the political influence that it exerts is certain to be evil in a corresponding degree. To survey the political relations of the drink traffic is therefore to present in wearisome detail familiar instances of odious political conditions. This subject may at present be dismissed with the general statement here made; it is more particularly considered in the article on POLITICAL EVILS.

---

[1] For these computations the editor is indebted to John Lloyd Thomas. The figures hitherto presented by Mr. Thomas have been specially revised and corrected for this work.

CHARACTER OF LIQUOR-SELLERS—POLICY AND METHODS.

Nothing more distinguishes the drink traffic from all legitimate trades than the ignorance, callousness and viciousness of the individuals engaged in it. Utter indifference to religion, morality, intelligence and the rights of persons is one of the chief attributes of the typical liquor-dealer. Indeed, it is all but impossible for any scrupulous man to enter this traffic. Many of the religious denominations absolutely refuse church membership to all its votaries. Not a few rum-sellers profess connection with the Roman Catholic Church; but this church, through its highest representative body in America, has in the most solemn language counseled its liquor-selling members to cease their disgraceful work and find more decent means of livelihood. There are few words that are more reproachful in the estimation of cultivated people in the United States than "liquor-dealer." The number of native Americans, or persons with names of English derivation, identified with the "trade," is comparatively very small.

The policy of the traffic is wholly selfish, uniformly obstructive and recklessly defiant. Apparently the experience of 50 years of Prohibition and severe restriction has not induced the liquor-sellers to participate in practical efforts for solving the drink problem. No co-operation has ever been volunteered or is to be looked for from them. While vast numbers of thoughtful persons are proposing and seeking to institute various remedies, the men who are pecuniarily most interested and who have it in their power to at least give evidences of a disposition to correct abuses are flagrantly exhibiting their contempt for law and for reform sentiment. The total inability of the traffic to demonstrate its right to exist, by seriously meeting the questions at stake, caused the most important liquor organ of the country to print these pregnant words:[1]

> "It is all very well for the wine and spirit trade to quiet its apprehensions by reverting to the majorities against Prohibition in the Michigan, Texas, Tennessee, Oregon and West Virginia elections, but the fact is still apparent that the sentiment against our business is constantly growing in this country and gaining friends among the most substantial element in our population. The question is a grave one, and the sooner we appreciate fully the hold it is securing on the public mind and conscience the better. It is to most of its followers what the slavery question was to its adherents—a great moral question. The good that alcohol does is little referred to; the harmful effects following its abuse are seen by all the world. To check this abuse is the aim of the conservative classes, and hoping to find a remedy in Prohibition they are rapidly falling into its ranks.
>
> "We are all familiar with society's complaints against the liquor traffic. We realize that there is good ground for many of these complaints. We deplore the facts, but stand helpless and without a word of advice to those who would correct them. Herein lies our weakness. We are without a policy. We see young men becoming drunkards, but we offer no remedy. We see old men turn to common sots, but we offer no remedy. We see the scum of society all flocking into the retail liquor business, but we offer no remedy. We see these men gain control of city governments, but we offer no remedy. We see the retail liquor business dragged down to the level of the bawdy-house and little hells are operated in public places under liquor licenses, but we offer no remedy. The great mass of our fellow-citizens are not opposed to the manufacture or sale of wine, beer or whiskey, but they are opposed to the abuses referred to above, and demand their correction. They are right, and we should add our protests to theirs. We should define an aggressive reform policy that will attract them to our standard. We should demand the passage of restrictive laws that will prevent any but reputable men retailing wines and spirits."

Occasionally fulsome utterances, promising or counseling reformation in the traffic, come from leading representatives of it or from influential organizations. For example, the National Protective

---

[1] *Bonfort's Wine and Spirit Circular* (New York), Feb. 10, 1889.

Association, at its first Convention (Chicago, Oct. 19, 1886), declared:

"RESOLVED, That we recognize to the fullest extent the duties and responsibilities resting upon us as citizens, and pledge ourselves to the faithful performance of every duty.

"RESOLVED, That we most earnestly favor temperance and most strongly condemn intemperance, and appeal to every member of the trade to make proof of this declaration by his daily life and the daily conduct of his business.

"RESOLVED, That it is our duty, as it is of all good citizens, to obey the laws of our country, and we condemn every violation of law, regardless of the damage inflicted in its observance upon any individual or upon our general business interests.

"RESOLVED, That we are in favor of both public and private morality and good order and popular education, and that we feel the duty resting on us as individuals and as a trade to work with the great body of our people in the advancement of these interests.

"We recognize and admit the evils that result from the abuse of all kinds of liquors, and condemn in the strongest terms every place, by whatever name known, that encourages or permits this abuse. We likewise condemn the indiscriminate issue of licenses and the establishment or toleration of places open to disreputable characters who expose their depravity under the guise of intoxication. Our interests, as well as our duty as citizens, demand that we enter a solemn protest against all such places, and pledge ourselves as a trade to co-operate with the officers of the law and with all good citizens to prevent the issue of licenses to all disreputable places."

But these sounding pledges and recommendations find no practical observance. In no locality and under no circumstances do the rumsellers live up to the spirit of the National Protective Association's platform, unless they are compelled to do so by public officials whom they cannot bribe or intimidate, or by public sentiment that they cannot override. Indeed, the only phases of policy that have the cordial support of the "trade" are the ones indicated in the following resolutions, from the same platform:

"RESOLVED, That we are unalterably opposed to Prohibition, general or local. . . .

"RESOLVED, That in our natural abhorrence of all titled rulers, and in our devotion to liberty, we should not install the statute-book as a tyrant, nor establish a tyranny in the law.

"RESOLVED, That we are in favor of absolute non-interference in politics as an organization, *except in such places and at such times as united action is necessary to protect ourselves and our business against such legislation as seeks to destroy our trade* and not to remedy evils therein existing.

"RESOLVED, That we endorse the license system and favor the enactment of laws by the States imposing a reasonable license. . . ."

The methods by which the "trade" prosecutes its policy are in all ways repugnant to fairness, decency and intelligence. Only the very ignorant rumsellers are frank enough to engage in open advocacy of the traffic on the merits of the questions involved. The leaders admit that it is not wise to defend the business of making and selling liquors, and that only by artful evasions, elaborate misrepresentations and corrupt practices can popular majorities for the saloon be commanded. There was never any attempt made to formally discuss issues from the pro-liquor standpoint until the National Protective Association came into existence in 1886. This organization announced that its especial purpose was to meet the Prohibitionists with facts and arguments, and many pamphlets and tracts were prepared under its auspices. But in the Prohibition campaigns in which these were circulated, the name of the Association responsible for them was suppressed, or veiled under such fictitious names as "The National Publishing Association" and "The American Printing Company."[1] The same organization, as a means of appealing to rural voters, published a pretended agricultural journal, called the *Farm Herald;* but similar artifices were resorted to.[2] The United States Brewers' Association conducts a "literary bureau," which employs unscrupulous and bombastic writers: the publications emanating from it are invariably sophistical, and never deal in an honest way with facts and statistics. It has indeed been the constant endeavor of the representatives of the traffic to prevent the ascertainment of truth and to avert a fair consideration of all the pertinent evidence produced by their opponents. Their steady antagonism to the demand for an impartial investigation of the public aspects of the drink question by a Federal Commission is a notable illustration of their attitude. The exhaustless wealth at their disposal has not been used, in any instance, for gathering and presenting weighty testimony, but for propagating the most scandalous falsehoods and deceptions and for bribing the editors of influential newspapers. With but few exceptions the special "trade" organs of the traffic display no editorial ability or intelligence. The excepted journals, representing the brewing, distilling and wholesale interests, are owned by wealthy men; but they take no part in the serious discussion of vital subjects.

---

[1] See the *Voice*, June 13, 1889. [2] Ibid, April 17, 1890.

The methods which govern all the efforts put forth by the traffic in seeking to control the public verdict were never hinted at more authoritatively or significantly than by the representative of the pro-liquor organization that had charge of the anti-Prohibition campaign in Nebraska in 1890. In a confidential letter he wrote: "In no event can we consent to an open association with the liquor interests of the country."[1] And the principal manager of the saloon canvass in Pennsylvania in 1889, in confiding to an interviewer his experiences and the secrets of his success, laid especial stress upon the recommendation, "Never try to defend the saloon."[2]

Livesey, Joseph.—Born in Walton, Eng., March 5, 1794; died Sept. 2, 1884. He was left an orphan at the age of seven and was brought up by his grandparents, who were in extreme poverty. As a boy and youth he worked at a loom in a damp cellar. He married at the age of 21, and soon afterward abandoned the trade of weaver and engaged in a provision business in Preston, Eng., which thrived and brought him a comfortable fortune. He reared a family of 13 children.

Despite the disadvantages of his early years he acquired a fair education by reading and study in his leisure hours. In January, 1831, he started a monthly magazine, the *Moral Reformer*, devoted to social reform. In it he advocated the repeal of the famous Beer act, which had come into operation in October, 1830, and which, though designed to promote temperance by discriminating in favor of beer, greatly stimulated the drink traffic and largely increased the number of public houses. (See p. 366.) On March 22, 1832, the Preston Temperance Society was organized, on the basis of abstinence from the beverage use of distilled spirits. Livesey was a prominent member, but the aim of the Society was not in keeping with his radical views. On Aug. 22 of the same year he drew up a pledge of abstinence from all intoxicating drinks, and induced one sympathizer, John King, to sign it with him. The Preston Society held its next meeting on Sept. 1, and the question whether the new idea should be approved was hotly discussed. Livesey produced the following pledge, which had been signed by himself, John King and five others:

> "We agree to abstain from all liquors of an intoxicating quality, whether ale, porter, wine or ardent spirits, except as medicine."

It is recognized by all that these "seven men of Preston" were the founders of the movement for total abstinence in Great Britain. Livesey was the father of the cause, and he was the only one of the seven who accomplished any notable work. In the next year (July 8) he, with five companions, members of the Preston Society, began a week's tour. They rode from place to place, going as far as Manchester and Bolton, displaying a banner on which a temperance motto was inscribed, distributing tracts and holding meetings in the open air or within-doors as occasion offered. The foundation of a temperance society at Bolton, on July 22, was one of the results of this tour. But in the time that had elapsed since the pledge was signed at Bolton, Livesey had not been inactive. On Feb. 28, 1833, he had delivered at Preston his celebrated lecture on "Malt Liquors," in which he gave facts and arguments to controvert the popular belief in the nutritive qualities of beer. This lecture, in condensed form, under the title of "The Great Delusion" was printed and very widely circulated, and copies of it were sent to all the members of Parliament. The *Moral Reformer* was discontinued with the number for December, 1833, but a new total abstinence journal, the Preston *Temperance Advocate* (monthly) was issued by Livesey in January, 1844. He wrote a number of tracts and made many addresses, giving his "Malt Liquors" lecture again and again. In its printed form it passed through many editions, and probably no other single temperance argument has enjoyed so extensive a dissemination in England. Mr. Livesey and Dr. F. R. Lees acted as Secretaries at the session of the British Temperance Association at Leeds, July 4 and 5, 1837.

---

[1] George L. Miller, of the Executive Association of the "State Business Men's and Bankers' Association of Nebraska," in a letter (dated Omaha, Sept. 20, 1890), to A. Lucius Rodman of Albany, N. Y. The so-called "Business Men's and Bankers' Association" was a liquor organization pure and simple, masquerading under a respectable name. (See the *Voice*, Oct. 2, 1890.)

[2] See p. 122.

Besides the periodicals already mentioned, Livesey published *Livesey's Moral Reformer,* a penny weekly begun in 1838; the *Struggle,* started in 1841 in advocacy of Free Trade and the repeal of the Corn laws; the *Preston Guardian,* established in 1844 and conducted until 1859 by Livesey and his son; *Livesey's Progressionist,* issued in 1852 and devoted to "temperance and physical, moral, social and religious reform," and the *Staunch Teetotaler* (1867). In 1868 he published his "Reminiscences of Early Teetotalism," and in 1881 his "Autobiography."

Local Option.—In its popular acceptation, Local Option is that legislative mode of dealing with the liquor traffic which permits citizens to determine by vote whether the sale or furnishing of liquors shall be allowed in a given locality during a specified period, usually of one or two years. Local Option is of two kinds: (1) A general statute may be enacted by a Legislature, with limitations, penalties, etc., made applicable to counties, townships, municipalities or other small districts, which territories may avail themselves, by popular vote, of the provisions of this general law; or (2) A special act may be passed for a given locality with restrictions, penalties, etc., applicable to that territory only. Statutes of the second variety are of many kinds. Some of them provide that when Prohibition shall have been carried in the prescribed territory no further elections shall be held under the act. This latter status can hardly be called Local Option at all, since the option feature is eliminated after the first affirmative vote. It is rather Local Prohibition, effected by the Legislature through the concurrence of the popular vote. Many counties in Georgia have secured such Local Prohibition. In a majority of the States, however, the option principle appears in the vote—usually annual—of towns or townships, upon the issue of license or no-license for the saloons.

Local Option laws differ widely as to scope of restriction and also as to extent of territory. Some prohibit the vending of all liquors, spirituous, malt or cider; others prohibit only distilled liquors. Some provide for the sale of certain liquors for medicinal or mechanical purposes; others make no such exceptions. Some prescribe penalties for their violation for the special territory concerned; others leave the whole matter of penalty under a general law, as in the case of other criminal offenses. Indeed, so wide are the variations of these statutes that only their general inhibitory feature allows them to be referred to the same genus of laws, while their local application gives them, in popular conception, a fancied resemblance to democratic methods.

HISTORICAL REVIEW.

Local Option grew up as a kind of natural fungus upon the license system stock. While statutory license laws were necessarily of legislative origin, and naturally applicable to the whole territory under the jurisdiction of the legislating power, the application of these laws and their enforcement were committed to local authorities in whose hands were lodged the issuing of the license, commonly the amount of the license fee, the infliction of penalties, etc. Thus the people learned to look to the local rather than to the State authorities as the dispensers of the license prerogatives, and so the local came to be popularly regarded as the real source of power. The citizen regarded the license-dispensing authority, with which he came into direct contact, as in some sort the proper authority also to refuse the license and prohibit the traffic. Local Prohibition thus grew up as the natural offspring of local license, and Local Option and local license have therefore much in common.

The chief merit claimed for the Local Option system is that it enables a small area to free itself from the liquor traffic when it would be impossible for the riddance to be effected in a whole State or large territory. Local Option has so far been applied only to the vending or "furnishing" of liquors, the manufacture and importation being beyond the scope of local legislation. County Local Option has found favor chiefly at the

South, while the town or township method has been common at the North.

As early as 1833 the Georgia Legislature extended to the inferior Courts of two counties—Liberty and Camden—the right to grant or to withhold retail licenses. As these Courts were elected by the people the law in effect became optional in its application. Prior to 1833, in many parts of the Union the constitutionality of the license system or, at least, the right of the State to grant license, began to be questioned. Between 1835 and 1840 local control, in some form, of the license-dispensing policy, had been acquired in several States. Six counties in Massachusetts, through the action of the County Commissioners, elected by popular vote, refused license. In 1838 Rhode Island and New Hampshire left license optional with the towns. Connecticut followed in 1839. Illinois granted to towns and counties power to suppress the traffic upon the petition of a majority of the adult male inhabitants. The rise of the Washingtonians, in 1840, and the general acceptance of their moral suasion policy, practically put an end, for several years, to Prohibitory effort. After this wildfire had passed the movement for Prohibition revived, but this time was directed generally in favor of State Prohibition, since the local acts were usually repealed after one or two years and the people began to grow disgusted with such instability. In Wisconsin, Iowa, Indiana, Connecticut and Michigan, a large number of towns had been carried for Prohibition—in Iowa, all the counties except Keokuk. Soon Ohio and Michigan made the granting of license unconstitutional. Most of the Local Option of this period fell still-born or died in early infancy. After State Prohibition had begun to be agitated, little more effort in behalf of Local Option in the ante-bellum period was made. Toward the close of the war Rhode Island engrafted Local Option upon her license law. Pennsylvania had a Local Option law from 1872 to 1875; Massachusetts followed in 1881. New Jersey's law was repealed almost without a trial. All the Southern States now have Local Option in some form.

Local Option has never effected general Prohibition in any State, unless, forsooth, through the negative force inspired by disgust at its failure. The system is certainly the most acceptable to the liquor power of all forms of Prohibition. In 1884 Hon. J. H. Murphy, a liquor representative from Iowa, introduced into Congress a resolution declaring that, "in the sense of this House, the matter of restricting and regulating the traffic in alcoholic, malt or vinous liquors in the United States belongs properly to the domain of municipal or local government, and does not fall within the scope of the powers inherent in the Federal Government in virtue of the Constitution." About the same time Hon. P. V. Deuster introduced an anti-Prohibition Amendment to the Federal Constitution, which should abrogate all existing State and local anti-liquor laws and render similar enactments illegal thenceforth. This extraordinary scheme would have prevented Congress from prohibiting the liquor traffic, and then made that body abolish all local Prohibitory statutes and forbid any such future legislation. Thus the liquor power manifests its readiness to use both National and State legislation to crush Prohibition.

CLAIMS OF THE LOCAL OPTIONISTS.

Local Optionists claim especially the following advantages for their methods:

1. That it secures and has secured Prohibitory laws over much territory where general Prohibition, through State enactment, was impossible. Witness the large number of counties, townships, districts and municipalities all over the land where such local Prohibition is in effect to-day.

2. That it is especially valuable to rural districts, where it is chiefly applicable, the contaminating traffic being thereby removed from the yeoman population—"the bone and sinew" of the land.

3. That it is essentially non-political and non-partisan in its operation, and thereby avoids collisions with parties and the antagonisms of politicians—an opposition invariably provoked by any party efforts to accomplish Prohibition. By thus eliminating or avoiding the opposition of political parties, all the friends of temperance may be united against the saloon. Moreover, only on this common ground can Republicans, Democrats and

other party adherents be rallied for Prohibition, as they are not compelled to surrender party affiliations ofttimes of life-long continuance.

4. That Local Option requires no new statement of position—no confession of faith as to tariff, silver coinage, race problems, universal suffrage or other vexed questions which must surely distract and divide whenever introduced. In this way the harmony of opposition to the saloon may hold all creeds, colors and castes under its banner, the destruction of the traffic being the only issue.

5. That by the retention of this live issue, popular attention cannot be diverted from the saloon's enormities; the public cannot grow indifferent to the ever present question, but must be constantly on the alert, for safety can be the reward only of eternal vigilance. So the Local Option condition may become an important factor in educating a people to the horrors of the traffic and the necessity for its suppression.

6. That the system, by steadily eliminating the traffic, tends gradually towards general Prohibition, to which it is therefore a kind of stepping-stone.

7. That the option principle accords best with popular ideas of local independence — sentiments everywhere prevalent in our democratic polity, *e. g.*, in the comparative autonomy even of our municipal governments in the regulation of their internal affairs. The principle thus commends itself by its general harmony with our political system.

DEFECTS.

But Local Option, as a temperance measure, has many radical defects. Some of these we will now consider.

1. The system is necessarily of a legislative and political character. The very enactment of such a law means that the crime-side of the liquor traffic is denied or at least not universally accepted, and therefore special statutes are needed to give authority to Courts and officials to deal with and punish its exercise. But legislators willing to enact, maintain and enforce such laws must be chosen. To the defeat of such lawmakers, of course, the liquor power is committed and the issue is made. Since Local Option leaves the question an open one, and the law always subject to change or repeal, it must forever remain in politics, and the election of all officials in any wise charged with maintaining or enforcing the law must ever be of a political character.

2. Although thus necessarily political in its workings, the option system is also non-partisan in its character. A non-partisan petition may bring on an election so non-partisan, indeed, that neither of the chief and law-making parties will dare endorse the measure; yet, if carried, parties and politicians altogether hostile must be depended upon to enforce the statute. It dares not promise support or threaten opposition to the parties and officials into whose hands its life is committed. It trembles while exercising the common "right to peaceably petition." Disarmed and neutral it is thrust into the arena, while denied the right of self-defense or even the maidenly privilege of choosing its own champion knights. Politically helpless and unresisting it is led away to be crucified.

3. Local Option, like license, makes revenues local but expenses general. County or Town A votes "For the Sale," levies its license fees, collects its police fines and monopolizes its private chain-gang of "rock-pile" labor; while its heavy criminal docket, pauperage, almshouses, and the fearful residuum of increased depravity and immorality which always follow the traffic, are thrown like an incubus upon the State and county at large. As license naturally shifts to the crowded communities, its revenues flow to the towns. To purchase popular indulgence these fees are commonly decreed to schools and benevolent purposes. Thus it has happened, especially in the South, that nearly all the well-supported public schools are in license towns and depend chiefly upon the liquor revenue for sustenance. As a consequence, thousands of families of our most substantial rural population are annually drawn into these towns to enjoy the benefits of the schools, and the children are brought face to face with the saloons and grow up under their baleful influence. The rural districts, on the contrary, thus lose their bone and sinew, their schools are made yet poorer and their industries languish. Thus the system operates to degenerate the people,

to crowd the towns and to depopulate and pauperize the country.

4. Local selfishness is therefore engendered and fostered. What cares Town A for the sword and fire it sends through the adjacent territory while it revels in its revenues? On the other hand, how much active interest will A—dry by Local Option—take in the struggles of B, C, D and the rest, against the destroyer? A's fight is won; aid she neither receives nor lends; the weak may take care of themselves. The policy is "too local and too optional."

5. Local Option—operating in this local, selfish manner, scattering and disintegrating the temperance forces and preventing unity of purpose and of effort, effectually militates against State and National Prohibition. So far from being a stepping-stone to general Prohibition, it has contributed so much to thwart such legislation that State Prohibition has never followed as a result of this disunifying measure. Local Option makes such general laws far harder of attainment.

6. Local Option impregnably fortifies the traffic from without, while it can be assailed only from within. Forty-four States are powerless against a single hamlet or county. A treaty of non-interference stands with the world outside. Five hundred saloonists may concentrate in a town or county, bid defiance to the nation and sell their liquors to debauch the whole country. Only at their own sovereign will can liquors be removed, while they, on the other hand, may have the land for a prey. The king of Dahomey may pave his chamber with the heads of his enemies, toss his subjects from a precipice and marry or murder half the women of his pigmy realm—the world has nothing to say. His majesty is lord absolute at home. So of the Liquor Dahomey under the option system. Strongholds of Bluebeards will be left all over the land and protected by law.

7. Local Option sounds an armistice to Prohibitory work but leaves liquor free. A county or a town is carried for no-license. The legal goal has been reached for the temperance forces, but liquor remains under arms, for its truce need last only 12 months or two years, and it may openly, defiantly build its batteries securely under Prohibition's silent guns—then, at a crisis, when the opportunity offers, it may strike its unarmed victim to the heart. Thus with all of advantage on the side of liquor, Local Option territory steadily falls back to the saloon's sway.

8. As a consequence, the enthusiasm of first temperance efforts dies out and it is next to impossible to preserve or to rearouse it for repeated elections. An abnormal tension—even in religion—cannot be maintained, for enthusiasm is not man's normal state. Temperance men weary with this everlasting crushing of hydras' heads, and not having—like their enemies—selfish motives in the contest, eventually give over the struggle, accepting "High License and strict regulation" as a substitute for Prohibition, and so the latter condition is usually far worse than the former.

9. Local Option has to Prohibitionists the character of a "suspect" from its correlation and companionship with license. The latter appears always as the alternate or supplement to the former. Both are local in operation; both involve permission to the traffic; the theory of each contemplates the continued existence of the traffic; neither proposes to touch the manufacture or importation of liquors; neither attacks the Internal Revenue system—the money power of the traffic; neither deals with the State as a whole; neither will prevent the traffic in the Territories, in the army, navy, or elsewhere (directly) under Federal jurisdiction; neither can hinder the traffic among the Indians. Both are directly or indirectly under local control. The two systems are naturally correlated, the twain have long lived side by side in most of the States, and in tolerable amity, as most wedded pairs. "High License with the Local Option feature" is the popular recognition of their relationship; while the "feature" of option in morals paralyzes all the temperance force in either. So helpless, indeed, is Local Option that it lives rather by tolerance than by inherent vitality. Its longest lease of life is where one political party is practically in undisputed ascendancy. The hot blasts of "close" State campaigns hardly allow it a span of life.

10. The system stands always as a compromise measure. Its basis is temporiz-

ing, temporary expediency. It is the commercial method of dealing with the traffic. It is made to stand aside in the interests of all parties, cliques, politicians and schemers. Its little ewe-lamb of Prohibition may be butchered for any stranger, be offered up to propitiate any liquor Moloch, and its blood may be sprinkled upon all the high places where sin holds its carnivals.

MORAL CONSIDERATIONS.

But far the greatest of all Local Option's defects is its rotten basis as to morals, where its presumptuous elective system appears most audacious. With its majority rule set up as the origin of right, the results are most destructive to all proper conceptions of divine law. Here it is best for us to compare the respective moral basis of Prohibition and Local Option, to see the broad difference between their foundation tenets. It is taken for granted in this discussion that there is a Ruler who governs the world by moral law; that this law is supreme in the affairs of men, and all human laws are, or should be, in conformity therewith ; that all human statutes sanctioning that which is forbidden by the divine law must be wrong; that conformity with divine law in the more effective enforcement of its precepts is the only proper object of civil legislation—the only justification for such laws to assume jurisdiction over the lives, liberty, property and pursuits of men; and that the liquor traffic is wrong as judged by every moral standard. With these lights let us examine the moral basis of Prohibition and Local Option, as judged by this divine law.

Civil law should, *per se*, prohibit the wrong and uphold the right. No constitutional provisions—those symptoms of moral weakness—ought to be necessary to authorize Courts to prohibit and punish the evil. Such is the ideal relation of law to crime. But the force of evil habits, of perverted views, has given a kind of legalization to wrong. Therefore it has been felt necessary to give authority to Courts, by specific constitutional and statutory backing, to deal with the wrong. Thus human depravity has constantly added to the bulk of such laws, when the moral code alone should have been a sufficient warrant. But all these civil laws must agree with, not contradict, the divine. Here is the basis of Prohibition, namely, in its harmony with God's law, which ever prohibits, never permits; always punishes, never legalizes the wrong. Prohibition does not assume the right of veto in moral law as does Local Option. A vote for it is a man's approval of the right. Prohibition provides for no alternative. Failure to carry it does not commit its adherents to license any more than the refusal of the multitude to accept Christ commits his followers to the service of Satan. The vote is not in regard to the rightness of Prohibition itself—only upon its acceptance or rejection. The exercising of the wrong is the issue—not the rightness of forbidding it. Israel might choose and risk the consequences, as to the Lord or the Baalim; but she did not choose as to the rightfulness of Jehovah's rule. So in the question of Prohibition, not the right of the law but adherence to it is the thing to be settled. Where Prohibition is already in force the right to repeal the law in favor of license cannot be morally conceded; where the inhibition does not exist, it should be incorporated into the fundamental law. If this can be done only by popular vote then the question may be submitted—not for acceptance or rejection at irresponsible option, but only for legalization of the inhibition. It will be observed that Prohibition being a dealing with morals, the right to reject it for the immoral cannot belong to the powers of human option.

Local Option, as a principle, is the ignoring of the moral in law. It totally rejects the eternity of right, since it as readily endorses the wrong and as cheerfully legalizes it. Indeed, it eliminates the moral entirely, save in so far as it itself, at its own will, creates it by its majority method. Thus the most destructive standards in morals are set up—standards which eliminate the moral from human action. The option principle recognizes no divine, unchanging, all-pervading law of right. A majority vote is its highest authority in morals; the right this year may be the wrong after 12 months. It assumes the prerogative to make wrong into right by investing it with all the sanctity of law. It puts right on trial for its life by a probation of one or two years. Local Option is merely a balancing between two wrongs, or a right—not as a right, however—against a wrong. It is always Local Option in one end of the scale and license in the other, never Local Option balanced against some other form of Prohibition. If temperance does not succeed, drunkard-making may be lawfully endorsed. If law-breakers defy and violate the law, then to prevent the violation the law should be set aside, we are told, and the crime legalized. The amount of violation is to determine the life of the law. A premium is set for a greater degree of violation.

Local Option's practical lesson is to go with the multitude, even "to do evil." Local Option's moral standard is the will of the majority—one of the fatal deductions from a democracy. Necessarily, therefore, not only the liberty to exercise the traffic but the right of the traffic itself is assumed. To illustrate: Had Joshua said to Israel, "Determine this year whether ye will serve the Lord or other gods, and next Nisan the question may be again submitted," then, of course, the right of submission and of decision would have been in the people's hands; no crime could have attached to the choice of Baalim, for the right to choose and to worship other gods would have been Israel's, and neither guilt nor punishment could have been visited upon them in the matter. This is Local Option. Prohibition would say in the spirit of Joshua: "As voluntary agents, responsible for your actions and their consequences, choose, this day, whom ye will serve; for you must bear your own sins. Nay, more; remember, you cannot choose the Lord this year and Moloch the next, for he is a jealous God. If ye forsake the Lord and serve strange gods, then he will turn and do you hurt, and consume you after that he hath done you good."

Here we can easily see the province of the option principle. The right of choice without criminality in its result was never thought of. The option of submission—like that of mercy—admitted the possibility, never the right, to reject. The opportunity for choice was given; not liberty to choose the wrong. Responsibility still hung over the choice. Opportunity there may be to contract debt, but no exemption from payment to the uttermost farthing. So of all questions having a criminal side as an alternate issue. A man has power and opportunity to steal; divine law inhibits the exercise of that opportunity, not the possibility of stealing. So far from guiltlessness attaching to choice, the choosing of the wrong but intensifies the criminality of the option.

Prohibition contemplates no other side—no alternative, no rejection of the divine law, least of all the right to reject. The choice of the right is to be final. "Put away, therefore, the strange gods from among you." Option would permit Israel to "hate knowledge" and "not choose the fear of the Lord." But for their option for the bad they must "eat of the fruit of their own way, and the turning away of the simple should slay them." Israel must "choose none of the ways of the oppressor, for the curse of the Lord is on the house of the wicked." For merely exercising this choice in the wrong direction they must "bow to the slaughter and be numbered to the sword." Option can choose, but never lawfully choose the wrong. The right to create right, to commit or permit crime, is at war with God's law. The option to approve and enforce this higher law never implies permission to subvert it. The option of obedience or rebellion is presented, but the choice is not without sin. Standing in the gate of the camp Moses gives option to Israel in the call, "Who is on the Lord's side let him come unto me;" but those who used their option to stay away soon felt the Levites' destroying swords.

Prohibition, then, is popular assent to the divine law; confirmatory, it expresses the consent of men to the rightness of that law and willingness to keep it. Option, on the contrary, would sit in a higher than Moses's seat, cite this law to trial, accept or reject it, and set up another standard in its stead. Option would make a law to sin by, or rather to turn wrong into right. The distinction between the principles is very broad. Prohibition will choose only right. Option says: "License or No-License; For the sale or against the sale; make your choice; it is immaterial in morals." Such a principle, generally applied in morals, would wreck the universe. It ignores the divine law and makes man's will supreme. H. A. Scomp.

Additional Particulars.—The Local Option provisions in the statutes of the various States and Territories, past and present, are summarized in the article on Legislation.

Although most of the Prohibition leaders—at least in the North—regard Local Option measures with pronounced dissatisfaction, few of them have refused to co-operate in the campaigns brought on under such measures. These campaigns have frequently been waged with great vigor, and in their results have been of much significance by showing the strength of local sentiment, bringing the practical reasons for and against the license system under searching review and demonstrating that the demand for Prohibition is not ephemeral, capricious or confined to a few extremists, but is constant, determined and widespread, and indeed touches the thought and action of the people more intimately than any other subject involving local policy.

The record made by the communities of the State of Massachusetts is especially impressive. The following tables show the number of towns and cities, respectively, voting for and against license, and the popular vote polled, each year from 1884 to 1889, inclusive :[1]

Year.	Towns (Voting in March).			
	No. Towns Carried Against License.	No. Towns Carried For License.	Popular Vote Against License.	Popular Vote For License.
1884	238[1]	86	41,413	34,592
1885	232[2]	93	39,428	34,463
1886	260[3]	65	45,066	31,252
1887	277[4]	49	54,603	34,433
1888	260[5]	68	47,622	35,340
1889	273[6]	53	49,971	34,834

[1] Including 10 towns that did not vote on the question. [2] Including 10 not voting and 3 in which the vote was tied. [3] Including 6 not voting. [4] Including 2 not voting. [5] Including 2 ties. [6] Including 1 not voting and 3 ties.

Year.	Cities (Voting in December).			
	No. Cities Carried Against License.	No. Cities Carried For License.	Popular Vote Against License.	Popular Vote For License.
1884	3	20	38,001	69,701
1885	5	18	41,733	57,956
1886	13	10	56,945	61,464
1887	8	15	63,385	75,555
1888[1]	7	17	59,782	90,141
1889[2]	12	13	64,695	73,944

[1] The last election before the High License and Limitation laws came into force. [2] The first election after these acts took effect.

Combining the votes of the towns and cities, it is found that, on the Local Option issue, there were anti-license majorities in the whole State of Massachusetts of 5,888 in 1889, 7,200 in 1887, and 9,295 in 1886. Yet on the question of Constitutional Prohibition, in April, 1889, there was a saloon majority of 45,820 (see p. 119), and this despite the fact that the aggregate vote cast on Constitutional Prohibition (216,304) was more than 7,000 less than that cast in the Local Option elections in the same year (223,444). This difference is easily explained. Local Option excites comparatively little antagonism; and the liquor men, knowing from experience that Prohibition in localities can be circumvented without special difficulty, do not put forth their energies in Local Option campaigns. The figures also show that notwithstanding the apparent majority of 46,000 against Prohibition in Massachusetts, there really exists in that State a predominant anti-saloon sentiment.

To further illustrate the strength of local feeling in favor of Prohibition, we give the following detailed exhibit of the vote by towns and cities on the license issue in Massachusetts in 1889:

Towns Voting Against License, March, 1889.

	License. No.	License. Yes.
Barnstable Co.		
Barnstable	13	6
Bourne	69	1
Brewster	47	14
Chatham	86	19
Dennis	85	4
Eastham	35	11
Falmouth	82	6
Harwich	108	19
Mashpee	26	18
Orleans	79	6
Provincetown	153	14
Truro	69	4
Wellfleet	97	..
Yarmouth	32	1
Totals	981	123
Berkshire Co.		
Alford	24	21
Becket	81	21
Cheshire	106	56
Clarksburg	7	4
Dalton	164	34
Egremont	103	42
Florida	30	28
Hancock	72	7
Hinsdale	149	85
Lanesborough	45	26
Lee	228	210
Monterey	41	23
Mt. Washington	16	11
New Ashford	16	13
New Marlbor'h.	83	51
Peru	20	7
Richmond	47	2
Sandisfield	108	23
Savoy	33	19
Stockbridge	145	120

Towns Voting for License, March, 1889.

	License. No.	License. Yes.
Barnstable Co.		
Sandwich	115	129
Berkshire Co.		
Adams	203	536
Gt. Barrington	246	366
Lenox	70	193
North Adams	543	995
Otis	26	58
Pittsfield	741	1,442
Sheffield	106	165
Totals	1,935	3,755

---

[1] These tables have been compiled from printed reports furnished by the Secretary of State of Massachusetts.

TOWNS VOTING AGAINST LICENSE, MARCH, 1889.

	LICENSE.	
	No.	Yes
Tyringham	30	17
Washington	21	12
Williamstown	255	78
Windsor	51	17
Totals	1,875	927
Bristol Co.		
Acushnet	40	9
Attleborough	396	208
Berkley	32	1
Dartmouth	135	22
Dighton	96	..
Easton	178	132
Fairhaven	205	7
Freetown	56	10
Mansfield	121	25
Morton	85	39
Raynham	68	11
Rehoboth	94	35
Seekonk	62	3
Somerset	119	52
Swanzey	88	30
Westport	131	2
Totals	1.906	586
Dukes Co.		
Chilmark	37	3
Cottage City	66	..
Edgartown	81	2
Gay Head	22	..
Gosnold	9	..
Tisbury	103	3
Totals	318	8
Essex Co.		
Amesbury	556	431
Andover	358	82
Beverly	473	236
Boxford	35	11
Bradford	190	140
Danvers	463	100
Essex	93	16
Georgetown	95	52
Hamilton	74	38
Lynnfield	59	20
Manchester	99	6
Marblehead	750	560
Merrimac	130	48
Methuen	328	181
Middleton	67	23
Newbury	68	22
North Andover	287	170
Peabody	712	639
Rockport	350	14
Rowley	90	44
Salisbury	98	58
Saugus	245	204
Swampscott	275	30
Topsfield	53	29
Wenham	58	12
West Newbury	102	23
Totals	6,108	3,189
Franklin Co.		
Ashfield	68	14
Bernardston	53	40
Charlemont	45	11
Colrain	41	13
Conway	108	57
Gill	30	14
Hawley	50	3
Heath	39	21
Leverett	39	..
Leyden	27	..
Monroe	26	18
New Salem	39	3
Northfield	97	70
Orange	466	95
Rove	36	24
Shelburne	77	8
Shutesbury	28	23
Sunderland	76	17
Warwick	44	21
Whately	38	34
Totals	1,427	486
Hampden Co.		
Agawam	121	53
Brimfield	74	20
Chester	75	72
Granville	108	39
Hampden	62	58
Holland	13	3
Longmeadow	76	1
Ludlow	61	6
Monson	234	127
Montgomery	40	7
Tolland	34	9
Wales	42	29
W. Springfield	312	113
Wilbraham	107	41
Totals	1,359	578
Hampshire Co.		
Amherst	136	48
Belchertown	134	60
Chesterfield	55	12
Cummington	64	10
Goshen	30	11
Granby	77	2
Greenwich	62	14
Hadley	110	66
Hatfield	57	27
Huntington	120	71
Middlefield	32	16
Pelham	42	16
Plainfield	74	3
South Hadley	259	57
Southampton	56	15
Westhampton	47	4
Williamsburgh	138	69
Worthington	50	6
Totals	1,543	507
Middlesex Co.		
Acton	88	68
Arlington	445	328
Ashby	47	25
Ashland	152	36
Ayer	148	1
Bedford	127	12
Belmont	127	21
Billerica	69	10
Boxborough	36	12
Burlington	42	34
Carlisle	40	17
Chelmsford	93	13
Concord	128	104
Dunstable	41	12
Everett	510	21
Framingham	784	648
Groton	105	28
Holliston	218	88
Hudson	450	197
Lexington	230	115
Lincoln	54	3
Littleton	55	5
Medford	496	460
Melrose	518	16
Natick	905	645
North Reading	41	20
Pepperell	269	206
Reading	261	41
Sherborn	64	13
Shirley	59	40
Stoneham	458	228
Stow	28	13
Sudbury	91	21
Tewksbury	82	15
Townsend	94	32
Wakefield	431	277
Watertown	459	319
Wayland	116	43
Westford	138	130
Weston	83	15
Wilmington	51	26
Winchester	238	2
Totals	8,871	4,360

TOWNS VOTING FOR LICENSE, MARCH, 1889.

	LICENSE.	
	No.	Yes.
Bristol Co.		
N. Attleborough	372	462
Dukes Co.—None.		
Essex Co.		
Groveland	59	75
Ipswich	171	204
Nahant	42	63
Totals	272	342
Franklin Co.		
Buckland	55	103
Deerfield	141	218
Erving	40	77
Greenfield	247	343
Montague	146	441
Wendell	28	34
Totals	657	1,216
Hampden Co.		
Chicopee	450	585
Palmer	249	302
Russell	17	153
Southwick	63	104
Westfield	490	763
Totals	1,269	1,907
Hampshire Co.		
Easthampton	256	279
Enfield	64	72
Prescott	18	23
Ware	321	401
Totals	775	659
Middlesex Co.		
Dracut	36	135
Hopkinton	232	267
Marlborough	600	1,117
Maynard	108	218
Tyngsborough	34	57
Totals	1,005	1,794

Towns Voting Against License, March, 1889.

	License.	
	No.	Yes.
Nantucket Co.—None.		
Norfolk Co.		
Avon	100	15
Bellingham	45	13
Braintree	279	90
Brookline	505	487
Canton	290	250
Cohasset	69	52
Dover	26	10
Foxborough	145	63
Franklin	277	145
Holbrook	195	60
Hyde Park	792	272
Medfield	59	25
Medway	261	201
Millis	39	26
Milton	303	16
Needham	226	75
Norfolk	49	6
Norwood	231	144
Randolph	413	179
Sharon	70	15
Stoughton	340	72
Walpole	147	75
Wellesley	121	37
Weymouth	496	410
Wrentham	64	32
Totals	5,542	2,770
Plymouth Co.		
Abington	230	130
Carver	44	13
E. Bridgewater	127	64
Halifax	41	14
Hanover	101	36
Hanson	85	18
Kingston	84	59
Lakeville	52	19
Marion	77	12
Marshfield	99	18
Mattapoisett	109	26
Middleborough	302	39
Norwell	101	46
Pembroke	67	14
Plymouth	438	249
Plympton	37	8
Rochester	34	..
Rockland	318	252
Scituate	94	46
Wareham	170	97
W. Bridgewater	85	65
Whitman	406	177
Totals	3,101	1,402
Suffolk Co.		
Winthrop	295	3
Worcester Co.		
Ashburnham	108	60
Athol	324	278
Auburn	67	2
Barre	96	33
Berlin	95	..
Bolton	54	21
Boylston	35	31
Charlton	85	28
Dana	56	29
Harvard	65	18
Holden	129	22
Hopedale	81	2
Hubbardston	69	32
Lancaster	130	78
Leicester	174	98
Leominster	537	277
Lunenburg	73	35
Mendon	56	8
Millbury	272	218
New Braintree	19	14
Northborough	112	64
Northbridge	83	13
N. Brookfield	336	150
Oxford	152	40
Paxton	38	15
Phillipston	35	17
Princeton	51	33
Rutland	72	68
Shrewsbury	101	34
Southborough	154	24
Spencer	440	373
Sutton	121	102
Templeton	175	77
Upton	114	98
Uxbridge	121	35
Warren	275	246
Westborough	419	247
West Boylston	129	73
W. Brookfield	86	13
Westminster	100	58
Winchendon	224	104
Totals	5,863	3,168

Towns Voting for License, March, 1889.

	License.	
	No.	Yes.
Nantucket Co.		
Nantucket	141	212
Norfolk Co.		
Dedham	374	423
Plymouth Co.		
Bridgewater	136	228
Duxbury	50	52
Hingham	198	316
Hull	21	71
Totals	405	667
Suffolk Co.		
Revere	237	386
Worcester Co.		
Blackstone	76	938
Brookfield	211	235
Clinton	618	945
Douglas	137	138
Dudley	66	167
Gardner	342	490
Grafton	250	262
Hardwick	84	120
Milford	513	740
Petersham	57	65
Royalston	51	60
Southbridge	358	389
Sterling	53	100
Webster	219	485
Totals	3,035	4,585

Tie Votes.

Berkshire Co.		
W. Stockbridge	70	70
Worcester Co.		
Oakham	46	46
Sturbridge	74	74

No Returns.

Hampden Co.

Blandford.

Cities Voting Against License, December, 1889.

	License.	
	No.	Yes.
Brockton	2,229	1,763
Cambridge	3,793	3,300
Fall River	4,190	2,731
Fitchburg	1,504	1,299
Haverhill	1,711	1,464
Lowell	5,457	4,457
Malden	1,186	848
Newton	1,841	750
Quincy	1,162	618
Somerville	1,706	635
Woburn	979	809
Worcester	5,189	5,119
Totals	30,947	23,793

Cities Voting for License, December, 1889.

	License.	
	No.	Yes.
Boston	17,875	27,134
Chelsea	951	1,647
Gloucester	861	1,342
Holyoke	767	2,253
Lawrence	2,593	2,792
Lynn	2,040	3,012
NewBedford	1,717	2.382
Newb'yport	718	1,164
N'thampton	722	748
Salem	1,293	2,237
Springfield	2,176	2,950
Taunton	1,244	1,486
Waltham	791	1,004
Totals	33,748	50,151

Connecticut is another New England State in which Local Option votes by cities and towns are taken annually, although its returns are not so extended as those for Massachusetts. Many of the Connecticut towns neglect the license issue, taking no vote upon it.[1] From an abstract of the votes cast for and against license on Oct. 1, 1889, specially obtained from the Secretary of State of Connecticut, the following summary is made :

Cities and towns for which returns are given, 81—of which 57 voted for license and 24 against.

Cities and towns which did not vote on the question, or for which no returns are given, 84—of which 33 voted against license at the last election and 6 voted for license, while the latest results in the other 45 are not stated.

Total number of cities and towns favoring license, 63; opposing, 57; attitude not stated, 45. (In most of the 45 unclassified towns no licenses are issued; so that a majority of the Connecticut communities are "dry.")

A peculiar system of indirect Local

---

[1] Due to the provision in the statutes that petitions must be presented before Local Option elections can be held.

Option prevails in the State of New York. In each town and small city the licensing power is wielded by a Board of Excise Commissioners, of three members chosen by popular vote—one member retiring and one new member being elected each year. The Board in every locality has absolute power to grant or refuse licenses ; and it is the constant aim of the temperance people to secure or retain control. The formidable strength of anti-license sentiment must be recognized when it is said that even under this imperfect measure it is wholly impossible to procure license in many parts of New York, and local agitation against the liquor traffic is in a great number of towns the chief feature of the annual elections. In other States, like New Jersey, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, California and many more, where local determination of the license issue is dependent on the action of the authorities, the strife with the dramshops divides public sentiment constantly and nearly always receives greater attention than any other permanent subject of local concern, so thoroughly has the Prohibition idea permeated the country. It is a peculiarity of these petty contests that defeat does not daunt the Local Option workers; and the constancy with which their demands are urged is one of the clearest evidences of the impossibility of solving the drink question by any measure short of Prohibition.

But while the town struggles are most instructive in making a minute analysis of what may be called the spontaneous disposition of the people at large, the aspects of County Local Option are hardly less interesting. County Option laws are more distasteful to the saloon element than those acts that apply merely to towns and townships; and legislative bills extending County Option have frequently been modified, at the instance of liquor leaders, so as to confine the exercise of Prohibitory rights to smaller constituencies. County Local Option campaigns are prosecuted with greater vigor, and have at times engaged general and systematic support.

Missouri is a typical County Option State. The county privilege is somewhat restricted, however, by the requirement that a Local Option vote in a county shall not affect the liquor traffic in any city within the county, each city being permitted to vote separately on the question. The following table gives the results of Local Option votes in elections held between June, 1887, and April, 1888, in 82 counties and 20 cities of Missouri: [1]

COUNTIES (82 of the 115).	LICENSE. No.	LICENSE. Yes.	COUNTIES.	LICENSE. No.	LICENSE. Yes.
Andrew	900	1,598	Macon	1,109	831
Atchison	1,436	1,355	Madison	761	742
Audrain	1,256	1,162	Marion	1,156	927
Barry	1,038	1,662	Miller	798	1,073
Barton	1,533	960	Mercer	1,191	529
Bates	2,476	1,255	Mississippi	847	810
Bollinger	598	1,062	Moniteau	826	1,759
Butler	635	749	Monroe	1,085	2,796
Cape Girardeau	1,053	1,920	N. Madrid	774	873
Caldwell	967	1,322	Newton	2,320	1,280
Carroll	1,502	1,062	Nodaway	2,426	694
Chariton	1,804	2,386	Oregon	392	707
Christian	726	635	Ozark	268	223
Clarke	1,050	1,386	Pemiscot	242	153
Clay	1,032	1,926	Pike	1,715	1,454
Clinton	1,492	656	Polk	1,219	1,785
Cooper	1,083	1,147	Pulaski	469	429
Crawford	1,102	492	Putnam	900	629
Dade	1,236	1,265	Randolph	477	1,664
Dallas	605	682	Ray	207	1,977
Daviess	1,740	923	Ripley	104	566
Dent	627	770	St. Clair	103	862
De Kalb	1,099	1,069	Saline	14	2,194
Douglass	248	231	St. France	67	1,419
Dunklin	1,044	946	Schuyler	302	972
Gentry	1,769	1,321	Scotland	89	377
Grundy	1,057	695	Scott	146	1,080
Greene	2,095	998	Shannon	106	219
Henry	2,185	1,595	Shelby	268	1,233
Holt	1,286	1,391	Stoddard	135	965
Howell	1,021	879	Stone	..	273
Iron	660	854	Sullivan	905	1,663
Jasper	2,274	760	Taney	107	482
Jefferson	1,170	2,096	Texas	637	556
Knox	885	634	Washington ...	214	977
Laclede	982	928	Wayne	117	797
Lafayette	1,255	2,952	Webster	209	239
Lawrence	1,679	937	Worth	700	945
Lewis	1,461	1,203	Wright	66	706
Lincoln	1,622	951			
Linn	1,443	692	Totals	92,134	85,986
Livingston	957	816	Majority ...	6,148	
McDonald	700	1,017			

CITIES (20).	LICENSE. No.	LICENSE. Yes.	CITIES.	LICENSE. No.	LICENSE. Yes.
Boonville	323	428	Macon	305	269
Brookfield	284	369	Marshal	353	324
Butler	337	247	Maryville	414	237
Cameron	267	203	Moberly	579	1,022
Carrollton	308	330	Neosho	206	167
Carthage	781	427	Pierce City	297	217
Clinton	478	421	Springfield	1,722	1,472
De Soto	310	347	Trenton	406	311
Fulton	300	378			
Kirksville	340	199	Totals	8,186	8,509
Lamar	291	274	Majority		323
Lexington	135	617			

Counties voting against license, 38; for, 44. Cities against, 13; for, 7.

In the other States that have tried the County Option system the anti-license people have enjoyed more or less success and the results have been uniformly significant. For example, in Michigan, under the law of 1877 (pronounced unconstitutional in 1888), 36 of the 82 counties voted out the saloons in a few months; in Pennsylvania, under the law of 1872 (repealed in 1875), more than 40 of the 66 counties did the same; in New Jersey, under the law of 1888, the Prohibition victories were so numerous that the politicians repealed the act the next year, and in Arkansas (which votes by counties on the license issue in September of every second year) the anti-saloon vote is always very large.[1] The vast area of Prohibition at the South, especially in the States of Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, Missouri, Tennessee and Kentucky, has been won chiefly by the county method, as Prof. Scomp has pointed out.

---

[1] Political Prohibitionist for 1888, p. 57.

As a rule, however, the ordinary Local Option contests excite little attention, and every year there are hundreds of town, township and county votes of which no record is made. It is only when exceptionally aggressive or important fights are waged that much interest is aroused.

Some of these fights are historic and almost take rank with the Constitutional Prohibition campaigns. The most memorable, undoubtedly, were those made in Atlanta, the capital of Georgia, in 1885 and 1887. The first one was won by the Prohibitionists, who secured a majority of 228 in a total of 9,000 votes; in the second there was an anti-Prohibition majority of 1,100 in a total of 10,000. In each year the city was stirred as it had never been, even by the most exciting political agitations. The repeal of the law was due to the unscrupulous methods by which the liquor element influenced the colored vote. Other Southern struggles hardly less remarkable have been undertaken in various important centres, like Jackson, Miss., Raleigh, N. C., and Rome, Ga., resulting in alternate victory and defeat for the opponents of the saloon. The changes attending these crusades have been strikingly illustrated in the city of Lynchburg, Va., where Prohibition was beaten by 1,100 majority in 1886, but in 1890 lacked only seven votes of success—a change of 1,100 in a total of only 3,400. At the North the annual city campaigns in Massachusetts seldom fail to show the increasing willingness of the people to seek the destruction of the saloon. Great strongholds of the traffic, like Worcester, Fall River, Lowell, Springfield and Lawrence have been carried at times; and the anti-license vote in Boston increased from 9,362 in 1882 to 17,875 in 1889. Cambridge, the seat of Harvard University — a city of 70,000 population,—which formerly gave liquor majorities, has since 1886 steadily refused to grant licenses.[2]

Necessarily the results of Local Option Prohibition have not proved so advantageous from the temperance point of view as those of complete State Prohibition. Crime, drunkenness and the other evils flowing from the sale of liquor have not been diminished in so marked a degree. But the results have manifested the superiority of even this unsatisfactory form of Prohibition as compared with any system of license, however stringent. Indeed, it is not conceivable that the number of anti-license cities in Massachusetts could have increased from three in 1884 to 12 in 1889, and the total anti-license vote from 38,001 to 64,695, in the teeth of a much more watchful and aggressive liquor opposition, unless experience had convinced the citizens of the benefits of Prohibitory law. (For important testimony bearing upon this point, see PROHIBITION, BENEFITS OF.)

Locke, David Ross. — Born in Vestal, N. Y., Sept. 20, 1833, and died in Toledo, O., Feb. 15, 1888. He was educated in the common schools and at the age of 10 was apprenticed to learn the printer's trade in the office of the Cortland *Democrat*. Seven years later he undertook a journey through the United States, and to meet his expenses worked both as printer and local reporter on various Western newspapers. In 1852 he joined James G. Robinson in editing and publishing the Plymouth (O.) *Advertiser*. Later he had charge of the Mansfield *Herald*, and in 1856 established the Bucyrus *Journal*, to which he contributed a series of stories that were republished in other papers. He had charge of the Bellefontaine *Republican* and was connected with the Findlay *Jeffersonian*, becoming its editor and proprietor in 1861. The action of some citizens of

---

[1] The following are the aggregate votes of the State of Arkansas on license for a series of years: 1882—for, 79,246; against, 45,187; 1884—for. 91,242; against, 44,366; 1886—for, 79,456; against, 62.260; 1888—for, 94,344; against, 68,035.

[2] Anti-license majorities in Cambridge: 1886, 566 in a total of 5,254; 1887, 566 in a total of 8,020; 1888, 664 in a total of 8.302; 1889, 493 in a total of 7,093.

Wingert's Corners, O., in petitioning the State Government to remove all colored persons in Ohio suggested to Locke the theme of his famous "Nasby Letters," the first of which, dated "Wingert's Corners, March the 21st, 1861" and signed "Petroleum V. Nasby," announced that Wingert's Corners had declared herself free and independent of Ohio. Others followed, at first in the *Jeffersonian* and then in the Toledo *Blade* of which he became editor and part proprietor. These letters exerted a powerful influence during the war and reconstruction periods. They were continued at intervals until Mr. Locke's death. In the later ones the views and logic of whiskey advocates were frequently and effectively ridiculed. In 1871 Mr. Locke removed to New York City and took charge of the *Evening Mail*, but a few years later he returned to Ohio and resumed his place on the Toledo *Blade*. In his youth he published a little paper devoted to temperance, and his advocacy of total abstinence and opposition to the legalized saloon made the *Weekly Blade* for many years the strongest and most widely-circulated temperance paper in this country. His temperance articles in that journal always ended with the words, "Pulverize the Rum Power!" He also made contributions to magazines in support of his antiliquor principles. He was a thorough Prohibitionist in sentiment but an unbending Republican partisan; and apparently he neither sought nor secured any extensive personal influence in the Prohibition movement. Besides the "Nasby Letters" he printed various volumes and papers on political and social subjects.

Logic, Liquor.—Those who sell intoxicating drinks and those who justify the traffic range all worlds in seeking arguments of defense and lines of exculpation. They start, like archangels, in Heaven itself, and end, like fallen archangels, in the lowest pit of selfishness. They begin by affirming that these drinks are the gifts of God, and that their use is sanctioned by the example of Christ. They are the gift of God precisely as the dagger is the gift of God; but what has that to do with the act of the assassin? A farther bestowment of God is our own reason, which bids us to put all his gracious concessions to those uses and those only in which they shall profit ourselves and others. The words of St. Paul are the eternal law of charity under which we hold all gifts: "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth." Scarcely another such accumulation of offenses, bitter and pervasive, is found in human history as that associated with the use of intoxicating drinks and the traffic in them; yet these men are ready to speak of this business as if it were a dispensation of the charities of Heaven. If love has nothing to say on such a theme as this, its lips may as well be cut in marble once for all.

Christ accepted the Roman Government and explicitly justified it in the teachings of the tribute money. Is patriotism, therefore, void, and the search for liberty among men an illusion? The one all-embracing plan of Heaven is progress, growth into the grace of God. This growth alters constantly the relations of action. There is no sacrilege more censurable, no profanity more complete, than bringing forward the innocency of a past action to cover the guilt of a present one, than this effort to plead the accidents of the life of Christ against the spirit of Christ. This is to stand in the way of exit when a building is on fire, because one may lean innocently on the door-post when there is no such fleeing of multitudes. If one is to use holy things he must use them in a holy temper, or they are most of all deadly. They become the name of God on profane lips.

Stooping a little from this direct appeal to God, these defenders of the traffic affirm: "You cannot make men moral by law." Ah! this much then is admitted, that the business does involve immorality; and the parry becomes, "This immorality can be rooted out only by pure morality; in such a conflict civil law is a sword of lath." We answer, Civil law is itself a moral agent, and a most primary and efficient one. We are using it in all the relations of life to secure the conditions and give the motives of morality; to express the moral temper of the community. A moral conflict is all-embracing. We enter it from every side. We bring to it the sweet words of affection and the strong hands of resistance.

Let law be immoral, and the society it encloses will be immoral. Nothing alone, indeed, not even law, can make men moral. We need all influences, individual and collective, persuasive and mandatory, to compass this great end. Give us moral forces in their integrity and entirety, as they flow through each mind singly and all minds in their conjoint civic action.

But "This is a free country," and freedom means to do as one pleases. Having tried their hand at perverting the grace of God, they now attempt to profane the liberty of the world. Liberty is for the sake of power, and power is for the sake of beneficence. He who uses his personal liberty to injure himself, and his civic liberty to injure others, robs them both of their value, and prepares the way for the loss of both. That which has kept men back so long from freedom has been their ignorance of the uses of freedom; and that which is ready to plunge them again into a more bitter bondage is this mistaking of license for liberty. Alas, that men should stand within the holy precincts of our civil liberty, which was so religiously won and at such infinite cost, and devote it to vice and woe—devote it to the very demon of tyranny.

Sinking a shade farther they say: "I do not compel men to drink; if people would stop drinking I would stop selling." These assertions concede that the sale of liquor is something short of personal right and needs the apology of affirming that the sin lies at least between the buyer and the seller—is a common one. If either is to let go of it both must let go. As long as the appetites of men give me a chance to sell, says the liquor-dealer, it is too much virtue to expect from me not to sell. The sin does indeed lie between the buyer and the seller. They are the two dogs in the fight who tear each other and hold on to each other in the grip of hate. But what of us who stand around? Shall we be indifferent to the brutal conflict or cheer it on? What of the fact that one of these dogs is armed with an iron collar, and the other naked to all injury? The buyer may be driven by an inexorable appetite that has robbed him of power, and the seller turns this weakness—a very censurable weakness, yet a weakness—into a means of personal profiting. Most shameful, yet most true confession of the craft, it never has had and can never be expected to have grace enough not to make what gains it can out of the infirmities and sins of men. We will hold on to our gainful end of iniquity, say they, till the men at the other losing end of indulgence let go. After the virtue of other men has made your vice impossible, will you indeed quit it? So we believe, and so we make haste to bring the compulsion of Prohibition to bear upon you.

Again, they bid under themselves: "I never sell to a man who is drunk." Why not? Which is worse, to make a man drunk or to make him dead drunk? If the transition at this stage of it is more brutish, it is also more innocent. The moral struggle in which you side with the devil takes place while the man is getting drunk. Once drunk, and he is only an insensate brute whose appetites are merely physical facts. It is by many degrees less sinful to fill a brutish man to bursting than it is to help a sober man down the incline to brutishness.

Having cast up these defenses in succession they now retire from the region of moral ideas and shelter themselves behind custom. "I am licensed to sell liquor;" "Resolved, That so long as our business is licensed by the United States, the State and county, we consider it perfectly legitimate and honorable, and do not think we deserve the censure which is constantly being heaped upon us." We are not disposed to enter into the common shame which lies between the licenser and the licensed. We have scant sympathy with the I-am-holier-than-thou air with which the licenser, having received his reward, draws together his robes and tries to keep clear of contact with the man who ministers his permission. We have some sad enjoyment of the cynical smile with which the liquor-dealer stretches out his hand and says, "My brother, this business lies between you and me." We turn loathingly from this haggling over the partition of infamy. If the above resolution of the liquor-dealers had really been just it would never have been offered. What galls them is the inextinguishable sense of shame which is in their own minds and the minds of men. If the harlot is licensed she does not thereby become an acceptable member of society. No approval can ever make her such. The eternal law of God is against her, and man cannot help confirming it. Men, in their very selfishness, despise the instruments of their own sins, as the Romans of old held in contempt the gladiator who fought for their amusement. Unjust as this aversion may be, the saloon-keeper may rest assured that the community which licenses him and the church which defends him will, more often than otherwise, think him and his ilk worthy of hell-fire—the hell-fire they have helped to kindle on earth.

One slight step farther: "Our business puts much money into the public treasury." We as a people have fallen perceptibly behind the Pharisee who would not devote to the service of the temple the 30 pieces of silver—the price of blood. We have no scruples. Let not, however, these hundred millions blind the eye by their own glitter. They stand for a thousand millions of most wasteful and wretched expenditure. They stand for money wrongfully taken from the most extreme poverty, money that all divine charity and human love would have devoted to the nourishment of women and children, to the safety of the body and the nurture of the mind. All human ties have been torn asunder in receiving that money, as much so as if it were the price of a slave. These hundred millions must stand forever as the visible sign of a thousand millions wrung from men in all stages of impoverishment, as the price at which we have valued the poor of our people. Bring to bear on these coins sharp-eyed moral vision, and symbols of debauch, poverty and crime will be seen intertwined in the device of every one of them.

"The liquor traffic gives work to many people;" "It makes business lively." That no condemning feature might be wanting to the manufacture of intoxicating drinks and to the traffic in them, this occupation is distinguished from all other lines of employment in the unfavorable ratio of labor to the capital engaged in it. (See p. 386) It is parsimonious above every branch of business in the accidental good of giving labor to workmen. The liveliness it imparts to business is the lumbering thud of the beer-truck in the crowded thoroughfare, issuing a few hours later in the idleness, unnerved energies and scattered ambitions of the saloon. Where is all worthy life, whether social or economic, so hamstrung as in the saloon? The saloon is the enemy of purity, honesty and enterprise; of every affection which prompts and rewards industry. If we could unite visibly the beginning and the end of this business, no kind of industry—unless it be that of the undertaker—would be found to end so quickly and so certainly in the charnel-house.

And now comes the last deep dip, as the bird touches the Dead Sea waves of sin: "I was brought up to this business, and I must live; if I do not sell, others will." If a man pleads that he must live, even though it be on the lives of his fellow-men, one feels like accepting the cynical reply of Talleyrand on a like occasion, "I do not see the necessity." It hardly seems possible that one should unite such a despicable reason as this, "I will make haste to earn the wages of sin, lest others should anticipate me in them," with that first argument, the grace of God and the example of Christ. Yet this connection marks one of the terrible features in this accursed traffic. Its leading advocates may stand in the pulpit, and thence the tenuous line of defenders may pass, like a thread, out of the church-door, through the thoroughfare, by the gilded saloon on the cross-street, down the lane, till it hides itself from sunlight and daylight in a dive. While the preacher at one end is quoting the example of Christ, the vendor at the other end mingles with the oaths that part his sodden lips that abortion of the moral reason, "If I do not sell others will." I rob, because the man behind me is a robber. Where, in all this continuity of sin-sick thought, is the point of sound division? Which of its two extremities would one prefer to occupy? In which direction do men shift most frequently in mutual ministration along this line of defense—from the dive to the pulpit, or from the pulpit to the dive?

God give us grace to speedily gather up all these interlocked reasons of a perverted heart, and cast them, like the chain with which Satan is bound and binds his followers, into the bottomless pit.

John Bascom.

Longevity.—The evidence that the use of alcohol shortens life greatly is ample and is daily becoming more convincing. There are few—if indeed there are any — of the questions relating to social and vital statistics which can be so easily and satisfactorily determined as this one. It is (if the abundant testimony so far adduced can be regarded as conclusive) a rule without any exception, that when two groups of men, the one group composed of alcohol-users and the other of abstainers, whose environments —except in so far as they are affected by the use of alcohol or by abstinence from it—have been brought into comparison, the abstainers have been found to have had a great advantage in the matter of longevity over the alcohol-users. This point of environment is of vital importance inasmuch as the returns of the English Registrar-General show that the various occupations or employments, in their influence on the longevity of those engaged in them, differ from each other to quite a surprising extent.[1] In some of these occupations, at certain ages, the death-rate is twice, in some thrice, and in some even four times as high as it is in others. Obviously, therefore, in such an inquiry as the present, it is necessary that keen watch be kept on the sanitary and other surroundings of the various groups which are compared. Thus, soldiers who are alcohol-users should be compared with soldiers, similarly circumstanced, who are abstainers. Abstaining workingmen ought to be compared with other workingmen who use alcohol, and not with alcohol-using clergymen, lawyers and business men—and so on.

An investigation of crucial importance bearing on this subject was recently concluded in England. It was "An inquiry as to the rates of mortality and sickness, according to the experience for the ten years 1878–87, of the Independent Order of Rechabites Friendly Society," and was conducted by Francis G. P. Neison, Esq., Fellow of the Institute of Actuaries, and barrister-at-law. The members of this Society are all abstainers and are mostly workingmen. Therefore a comparison between their rate of mortality and the rate of mortality of the members of other workingmen's benefit societies may legitimately be made. No one could be better fitted for undertaking it than Mr. Neison. He is an expert in benefit society matters, and has conducted several investigations as to the rates of mortality and sickness of the Order of Odd-Fellows and the Order of Foresters, both of which are very large and very important non-teetotal benefit societies with a membership consisting chiefly of respectable workingmen. The longevity of members of each of these three societies, as ascertained by Mr. Neison, is set forth as follows:

FROM AGE	SUMMARY OF THE RATES OF MORTALITY PER CENT. IN EACH PERIOD OF YEARS.		
	Odd-Fellows. 1866–1870.	*Foresters.* 1871–1875.	*Rechabites.* 1878–1887.
20 to 30	7.0	7.4	5.2
30 to 40	9.2	9.9	5.5
40 to 50	13.4	14.8	8.5
50 to 60	22.5	25.3	17.0
60 to 70	44.7	48.7	39.0
70 to 80	96.5	99.1	97.3

Here, manifestly, the Rechabites have a very considerable advantage in the matter of longevity over both the Odd-Fellows and the Foresters. But there is other evidence derived from unquestionable sources that points in the same direction.

The following table, which gives the number of deaths per 1,000 per annum, at the ages named, of Rechabites, Foresters, "Healthy Assured Males" and "Males of All England," should be read thus: *Of* 1,000 *Rechabites, aged* 25, 5.080 *will die before reaching the age of* 26*; of* 1,000 *Foresters aged* 25, 7.370 *will die*

---

[1] These differences make a very decided showing in favor of those classes especially noted for sobriety and total abstinence and against those that are distinguished above all others for recklessness in the use of liquors. Every one will admit that the clergymen and farmers belong peculiarly to the first-mentioned classes, and the brewers, saloon-keepers, beer-dealers, hotel servants and bartenders to the second-mentioned. The Registrar-General's report for 1885 gives the results of a very careful inquiry concerning the death-rate of all males in England and Wales between the ages of 25 and 65, and of separate classes of males, by occupations. The death-rate of "all males" is placed at 1,000, and on this basis the following comparative figures are presented:

Death-rate of	
All males	1,000
Clergymen	556
Farmers, etc	631
Laborers, agricultural	701
Males in selected healthy districts	804
Carpenters and joiners	820
Coal miners	891
Masons and bricklayers	969
Plumbers, painters, etc	1,202
Brewers	1,361
Saloon-keepers, beer-dealers, etc	1,521
Hotel servants, bartenders, etc	2,205

The Registrar-General, in his summary of the facts shown in his report, makes the significant comment that "the mortality of men who are directly concerned in the liquor trade is appalling."

before reaching the age of 26; *of* 1,000 "*Healthy Assured Males*" 6.630 *will die before reaching the age of* 26; *and of* 1,000 "*Males of all England*" 7.729 *will die before reaching that age*—and so on.

Age.	Adjusted Rate of Mortality per 1,000 per Annum, in the Order of Rechabites, for the 10 Years Ended Dec. 31, 1887.	Rate of Mortality per 1,000 per Annum, in the Order of Foresters, for the 5 years 1871–5.	Rate of Mortality per 1,000 per Annum of the "Males of All England," 1871–80.	Rate of Mortality per 1,000 per Annum, of "Healthy Assured Male Lives," According to the Experience of 20 Life Assurance Officers, Collected by the Institute of Actuaries.
25	5.080	7.370	7.729	6.630
30	5.120	8.070	9.386	7.720
35	5.450	10.130	11 276	8.770
40	6.460	12.080	13.893	10.310
45	8.570	15.110	16.601	12.190
50	11.970	18.650	20.390	15.950
55	17.190	26.260	26.669	21.030
60	25.150	33.660	35.450	29.680
65	38.970	49.370	48.855	43.430

It is important that the differences between these tables should be noted. They are just such as the returns of the Registrar-General and the results of the investigations conducted by Mr. Neison would lead us to expect. The highest rate of mortality is amongst the "Males of All England." This section includes the whole of the males belonging to all diseased and defective classes in the country, and, of course, in it the death-rate is very high. The next in order is that of the Foresters. The position of those composing this section is considerably better than that of the males in general. Obviously, people of abnormally feeble constitutions and those known to be subject to hereditary disease, are excluded from the Foresters. The next in order is that of the "Healthy Assured Males." Those included in it belong mainly to the middle and upper classes, whose sanitary conditions and surroundings are of the best. They are also *selected* lives. Their death-rate, consequently, is considerably lighter than that of the Foresters and very much lighter than that of the "Males of All England." The lightest death-rate of all, however, is that of the members of the Order of Rechabites. Their rate of mortality is very considerably lighter than even that of the middle and upper-class healthy assured males. This is very noteworthy, for of course the real and legitimate comparison is between the Rechabites and the Foresters, who, saving in the one point of using or not using alcohol, are practically in identical circumstances. One point of importance must here be noticed. The investigations as to the mortality of the Rechabites are somewhat more recent than are those as to the mortality of the other sections under notice; and during the last 10 years, as compared with the preceding 20 years, there has been a considerable decrease in the average death-rate of the United Kingdom. Hence it is necessary to make a deduction from the death-rates given of the Foresters, the "Males of All England" and the healthy assured males sufficient to cover the difference. A deduction of about 7½ per cent. would be amply sufficient on this account. But after this deduction has been made the balance in favor of the Rechabites will still be very great.

Now, if the matter were left at this point, the case in support of the thesis that the use of alcohol is the great shortener of life would be one of the strongest; but it is not necessary to leave it in this position. Much additional evidence of a similarily cogent character can be presented.

The Sons of Temperance Benefit Society, an organization similar in all essential particulars to the Order of Rechabites, has a death-rate corresponding very closely to that of the Rechabites. In addition to all this, insurance societies that insure both abstainers and non-abstainers in separate sections, and record their life experiences separately, have a similar mortality experience to that of the Rechabites. The Sceptre, with 23 years' experience, has a death-rate of a little under 5 per 1,000 on the average per annum amongst the teetotalers, and a fraction over 10 per 1,000 amongst the general section. This Society, which consists, in both sections, of exceptionally young insurers, has, even for insurers exceptionally young, an abnormally low rate of mortality in both sections. This, so far at least as the teetotal section is concerned, will be seen from the astonishing fact that while amongst the healthy assured males the rate of mortality at the early age of 19 is 5.750 per 1,000, the death-rate amongst the teetotal insurers at all ages with the Sceptre has, on the average of 23 years, been only about 5 per 1,000 per annum. The Whittington Society has a death-rate of 8.74 for the teetotalers, and 16.35 for the non-abstainers. Something must be allowed in both these societies for the fact that on the average the teetotalers amongst their insurers are younger than the non-teetotalers. But it has been found that between the ages of 30 and 50 in the Whittington, the death-rate for the temperance people is only 6.72 per 1,000 per annum. The significance of this fact will be recognized when it is remembered that the annual death-rate per 1,000 amongst "Healthy Assured Males" at the age of 30 is 7.720, at the age of 40 is 10.310, and at the age of 50, 15.950.

Two other English societies which insure "temperance lives" have lately been established, and their experience is not less favorable to the views of the temperance party than that of the older societies. These are the Scottish Temperance Life Assurance Company (limited), and the Blue Ribbon Life, Accident, Mutual and Industrial Insurance Company (limited). Each of these societies has recently issued its first quinquennial report. In the case of the first-named, in the temperance section, only 34 deaths have occurred per 100 of those which, according to the "Healthy Males" table, were expected; and, in the general section, 62 per 100 of those expected. In the Blue Ribbon Company the mortality experience has been equally favorable. It must, however, be remembered that so exceptionally low a death-rate cannot be expected to be maintained, as the whole of the insurers in both these societies have quite recently been passed by the medical officers, so that latent imperfections of constitution which, in a certain proportion of cases, will by and by affect the rate of mortality, have not yet had time to do so. This peculiarity, however, affects both teetotalers and non-teetotalers alike—hence the point to be noticed is the difference between the death-rate in the teetotal section and that in the general section, which is very marked.

Probably, however, the most valuable of all the evidence that can at present be obtained from the statistics of assurance associations is that supplied by the United Kingdom Temperance and General Provident Institution. This society has had a long and wide experience. The comparison between the mortality experience of the temperance and that of the general insurers is based on the extent of the difference between the *expected* and the *actual* deaths in both sections; and the "expectation" is based on the death-rate in the actuaries' tables. The results are these: For the 20 years 1866–85 the expected deaths in the temperance section were 3,384, and the actual deaths were 2,408; while in the general section the expected deaths were 5,431, and the actual deaths were 5,284. One significant fact is that there has been a gradual decrease in the death-rate of the abstainers during the whole period. For the five years 1866–70, of every 100 deaths expected 74 took place; for the years 1871–5, of every 100 expected deaths 71 occurred; for the years 1876–80, of every 100 expected deaths 70 took place; and for 1881–5 the deaths were 70 for every 100 expected.

Mr. Neison calculates that of 1,000 Foresters, at 18 years of age, 118 will reach 80; while of 1,000 Rechabites of 18, no fewer than 164 will reach that age. The following fact, brought to light by recent investigations of the British Medical Association, is strongly confirmatory of the evidence already given. Of a total number of people over 80 years of age, whose cases were investigated by the Association, it was found that 36 per cent. were total abstainers. Considering how small a proportion of the general community are abstainers, this is a remarkable result.

One other point ought to be noticed. The difference between the death-rate of teetotalers and that of alcohol-users does not measure the extent of the mortality caused by drink; for many teetotalers have sustained injury from their own former intemperance, many from their parents' intemperance, and all of them from the general lowering of the conditions of life which is caused by drinking.

JAMES WHYTE.

Much stress has been laid by unthinking or unscrupulous persons in the United States upon certain interpretations of statistics recently collected by the British Medical Association. The following, from the *Wine and Spirit Gazette* (accepted without question by hundreds of American newspapers and reprinted by them) is a specimen of the deductions that have been made:

"The British Medical Association appointed a Committee to make inquiries in order to ascertain the average age of the different categories of drinkers—that is to say, those who refrain completely from alcoholic drink, those who indulge more or less in moderation, and those who drink to excess. This Committee has handed in its report. Its cases are drawn from 4,234 deaths, which are divided into five categories of individuals, with average of age attained by each:

1. Total abstainers................	51 years	22 days.
2. Habitually temperate drinkers..	63 "	13 "
3. Careless drinkers................	59 "	67 "
4. Free drinkers	57 "	59 "
5. Decidedly intemperate drinkers.	53 "	3 "

These figures show, singularly enough, that those who reach the shortest age are those who drink no alcohol whatever; after them come the drunkards, who only exceed them by a trifle. The greatest average age is those who drink moderately."

The investigation in question was superintended by Dr. Isambard Owen, and when his attention was called to the attacks on total abstinence, based upon his figures, he wrote the following letter to the Secretary of the United Kingdom Alliance:

"Sir.—As the author of the report on 'The Connection of Disease with Habits of Intemperance,' issued last year by the Collective Investigation Committee of the British Medical Association, I shall be glad if you will allow me to correct certain erroneous ideas of its purport which, I am informed by numerous correspondents, have become current among the public, and are being disseminated by interested persons in a manner calculated to do serious mischief.

"It is constantly being asserted, I am told, on the authority of the report in question, that abstinence from alcoholic liquors has been proved to be a habit eminently prejudicial to health, and that total abstainers have been shown to be a shorter-lived body of men even than habitual drunkards.

"Permit me to say, sir, that my report is not answerable for any such absurdities. The assertions I refer to are founded on certain statistical figures contained in the report, which are systematically quoted apart from their context, and in defiance of the explanations therein given. The actual conclusions of the report, as regards relative longevity, are as follows:

"1. That habitual indulgence in alcoholic liquors beyond the most moderate amounts HAS A DISTINCT TENDENCY TO SHORTEN LIFE, the average shortening being roughly proportioned to the degree of indulgence.

"2. That of men who have passed the age of 25, the strictly temperate, on the average, live at least 10 years longer than those who become decidedly intemperate. (We have not, in these returns, the means of coming to any conclusion as to the relative duration of life of total abstainers and habitually temperate drinkers of alcoholic liquors.) I am, sir, your obedient servant, Isambard Owen, M.D."

Mr. James Whyte (the writer of the preceding article) makes a further explanation, as follows:

"The temperance movement is comparatively new, and, as is well known, it is among the young mainly that, during the last quarter of a century especially, it has been influential and successful. Hence it is that the *proportion* of teetotalers in the section of the community between 25 and say 35 or 40, is enormously greater than among that portion of it whose ages exceed 35 or 40 years. As there is no period of life at which there are not *some* people who die, and as the *rate* of mortality is very much lower in early manhood than it is later in life, we should expect to find that amongst teetotalers the deaths which have occurred would, in proportion to the number of teetotalers living, be few, and, *on the average*, would have taken place *at a relatively early age.*"

And the organ of the British Medical Association, the *British Medical Journal*, has added its condemnation of the writers who use this report to assail total abstinence:

"Rarely (says the *Journal*) has any document been the subject of such extraordinary misconception and misrepresentation as has fallen to the lot of Dr. Isambard Owen's report of the collective investigation on the connection between drinks and diseases. All over the kingdom Dr. Owen has been represented as laying down, from the returns sent in to this committee, that total abstainers do not live so long as moderate drinkers, or even as those who are actually intemperate. We need hardly say to our readers that Dr. Owen has never said anything of the kind. On the contrary, he distinctly stated that no conclusion could be drawn from the returns as to the relative longevity of teetotalers. It is true that the figures warrant the construction of a table from which a casual observer, ignorant of the subject, might suppose that the average life of the abstainer was some nine months less than that of the decidedly intemperate. But Dr. Owen devotes considerable space for the exposure of such a fallacy. His explanation of the apparent anomaly is simply that, as the greater number of converts to abstinence have been from the young during the three years embraced in the returns, the average age of adult abstainers must have been less than the average age of drinkers. He supports this explanation by constructing two tables of the average at death of persons between 30 and 40, and of those above that age, with the result that the relative proportions are greatly altered.

"The conclusion, erroneously attributed to Dr. Owen, is utterly unwarrantable, though it has been paraded in high-class journals of which better things might have been expected. Taking into consideration how valueless vital statistics are without the explanations which usually accompany them, it is curious how so many writers have seized upon a few isolated figures, have put an interpretation on them which they did not warrant, and have credited conclusions to the editor of the returns which he not only never drew, but actually showed good reason for not drawing. A careful perusal of the committee's report would have saved not a few literary critics from a ludicrous blunder."[1]

In another article (March 17, 1888), the *British Medical Journal* reviewed, with considerable formality, the mortality figures of total abstinence insurance societies as compared with those of companies that insure teetotalers and drinkers promiscously, and made this comment: "There can be little doubt as to the general tendency of these striking tables in favor of healthfulness of abstaining temperance."

In the United States the testimony of experts in life insurance is exceedingly strong in confirmation of the opinion that the use of alcohol in any form, even in so-called moderation, tends to shorten life. The *Voice*, in 1884 and 1885, submitted to the officials of many insurance companies the following statement from Jacob L. Greene, President of the Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Company:

"It has been my duty to read the records of and to make inquiry into the last illness and death of many thousand persons of all classes in all parts of the country. . . . Among the persons selected with care for physical soundness and sobriety, and who are, as a rule, respectable and useful members of society, the death-rate is more profoundly affected by the use of intoxicating drinks than from any other one cause, apart from heredity.

"I protest against the notion so prevalent and so industriously urged that beer is harmless, and a desirable substitute for the more concentrated liquors. What beer may be and what it may do in other countries and climates, I do not know from observation. That in this country and climate its use is an evil only less than the use of whiskey—if less on the whole—and that its effect is only longer delayed, not so immediately and obviously bad, its incidents not so repulsive but destructive in the end, I have seen abundant proof. In one of our largest cities, containing a great population of beer-drinkers, I had occasion to note the deaths among a large group of persons whose habits, in their own eyes and in those of their friends and physicians, were temperate; but they were habitual users of beer. When the observation began, they were upon the average something under middle age, and they were, of course, selected lives. For two or three years there was nothing very remarkable to be noted among this group. Presently death began to strike it and until it had dwindled to a fraction of its original proportions the mortality in it was astounding in extent, and still more remarkable in the manifest identity of cause and mode. There was no mistaking it; the history was almost invariable—robust, apparent health, full muscles, a fair outside, increasing weight, florid faces; then a touch of cold or a sniff of malaria, and instantly some acute disease, with almost invariably typhoid symptoms, was in violent action, and ten days or less ended it. It was as if the system had been kept fair outside while within it was eaten to a shell; and at the first touch of disease there was utter collapse—every fiber was poisoned and weak. And this, in its main features—varying, of course, in degree—has been my observation of beer-drinking everywhere. It is peculiarly deceptive at first; it is thoroughly destructive at the last."

James W. Alexander, Vice-President of the Equitable Life Assurance Society, wrote:

"No one can attend to the settlement of losses in an insurance company without being painfully reminded of the danger to life arising from intemperance; and how often what even we designate as moderate drinking expands into immoderate drinking and causes early death, is hardly realized by those who do not have the evidence brought under their eyes as we do. I suppose that next to pulmonary diseases more persons come to their death, either directly or indirectly, by alcoholism than from any other one cause. Hundreds of men who die from liver complaint, kidney troubles, etc., etc., might have been healthy men to-day if they had not poisoned their systems with alcohol. . . . We have for some time charged extra rates for brewers and persons engaged in the manufacture and sale of beer and spirits, even when the applicants themselves were abstemious men, for we fear that persons so engaged cannot keep so near the fire without getting burned. Other things being equal, I think we should always give the preference to total abstainers, excepting those who have been excessive drinkers and who have reformed. These we are obliged to be cautious about on account of the terrible danger in which a man who has once been a drinker stands of falling back in the habit."

Walter R. Gillette, Medical Director of the Mutual Life Insurance Company, wrote:

"If there is anything proved by our mortuary experience it is that those who abstain from the habitual or excessive use of alcoholics have a far greater chance of long life than those who indulge in these beverages. . . . There can be no question but that total abstainers have a much better chance of longevity than those who drink even in moderation. . . . This rule applies to the use of malt liquors as well as to spirituous liquors. The fact is that drinkers of malt liquors take more spirits than the ordinary drinkers of alcoholics, inasmuch as beer is a seductive drink and it is necessary to take a larger amount of malt liquors to get the equivalent in effect of one or two drinks of ordinary spirits. . . . Our experience is simply the experience of all other companies in the matter of alcohol. We look upon it as a poison as it is generally used, and wish we could eliminate it entirely from the drinks of our insured; but so long as this cannot be done, we shall use the greatest care possible to ascertain their habits in this regard. Nevertheless, with all our care and investigations, the Company is called upon yearly to pay losses due both directly and indirectly to the use of alcohol which, could the figures be accurately ascertained, would be appalling."

---

[1] *British Medical Journal*, Sept. 1, 1888.

Henry Tuck, M.D., Medical Director of the New York Life Insurance Company, wrote:

"We are very confident that total abstainers stand a better chance of attaining a good longevity than what are known as 'moderate drinkers.'"[1]

Louisiana.—See Index.

Loyal Temperance Legion.—In the first National Convention, called to meet in Cleveland in 1874, for the purpose of organizing the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Plan of Work Committee besought all friends of the cause to take immediate measures for the formation of juvenile temperance societies. The Committee on these societies, consisting of "Mother" Thompson, the Crusade leader, Miss Frances E. Willard and Mrs. A. M. Noe, recommended that in the new paper, ordered by the Convention, a department be instituted for children and youth. The same Committee in 1875 authorized the preparation of a juvenile song-book and manual. The Convention of 1876, held in Newark, N. J., advised that the children be organized under the name "Juvenile Temperance Societies." In connection with the Convention of 1877, in Chicago, a children's mass-meeting was held on Sunday afternoon. The resolutions of this Convention dwelt on the need of instructing the children along the line of scientific temperance, and the Juvenile Committee recommended that the stress of effort be laid on reaching the children through Sabbath-schools. The Juvenile Committee of 1880 presented a constitution for children's societies, which included the pledge against all intoxicating liquors and tobacco. This year the system of standing committees for department work was abolished, and that of individual Superintendents took its place. Miss Elizabeth W. Greenwood of Brooklyn was placed in charge of the Juvenile Department, which, in distinction from the Sunday-school Department and that of Scientific Temperance Instruction in the Public Schools, finds its expression in the organized societies of children auxiliary to the W. C. T. U. Time has proved that each of these departments, together with that of the Kindergarten, since added, has its own special mission, all being necessary to round out the full measure of opportunity for reaching the children. In 1882 Miss Greenwood was succeeded by Miss Nellie H. Bailey of Chicago. In 1883 Mrs. Anna M. Hammer of Newark, N. J., was elected Juvenile Superintendent. Her resignation in 1887 was followed by the appointment of the present incumbent. Previously to 1886 the various juvenile societies had existed under many local names, but at the National Convention, held that year in Minneapolis, it was decided to give to each of these societies not only a uniform plan of organization but also the name of Loyal Temperance Legion, which in each State would consist of as many divisions as there were districts or counties, the local societies of each division being known as Company A, Company B, etc., according to date of organization. To Mrs. Caroline B. Buell, Corresponding Secretary of the National W. C. T. U. belongs the honor of having originated, and to the Connecticut W. C. T. U. the distinction of having been the first to adopt, this name and plan in all their essential features.

The original thought of a temperance school, where the instruction is given by classes, is still largely carried out, while the frequent application of new methods and helps prevents a wearisome monotony. The children not only fill the offices of Juvenile President, Secretary and Treasurer, under the leadership of an adult Superintendent, but also serve on various committees, whose reports add to the interest of regular meetings. The companies are frequently graded by being divided into platoons, each of which has its own leader, who is styled Ensign and who is responsible for the regular attendance of the platoon. Care is taken to have frequent rotation in the juvenile offices, which can be multiplied as circumstances suggest. Special methods are employed for holding the older boys and girls. Bands of Mercy have been largely introduced into the companies, the endeavor being to foster all sweet and tender graces.

---

[1] For the letters from which the above quotations are made, and numerous others from insurance companies, see the *Voice* for Oct. 16, 1884, and Jan. 1, 8 and 15, 1885.

The aim is not only to make the children intelligent total abstainers, ready always to give a reason for their principles and practice, but also to train them into efficient workers for Prohibition in State and nation. In Prohibitory Amendment and no-license campaigns, as well as in many other directions, they have proved themselves valuable helpers. Their loyalty to their pledge of total abstinence against alcoholic beverages of every name, tobacco in any form, as well as all profanity, has repeatedly stood the test of great temptation, statistics showing that 93 per cent. of those thus pledged stand true. The delightful entertainments given by the children must be counted among the most potent factors for arousing Prohibition sentiment in many localities, where leading men have not been ashamed to acknowledge the persuasive power of these sweet young voices in recitation and song.

The Juvenile Department has an extensive literature of its own, in the form of Catechisms, Lesson Manuals, Blackboard Talks, Pledge-cards, Song-books, "Loyal Leaflets" for distribution at children's meetings, and choice temperance stories for home and library. Miss Julia Coleman of New York was the pioneer in the preparation of these juvenile temperance supplies, the National Temperance Society being the publisher. Later this work has been taken up by the Woman's Temperance Publication Association of Chicago. In addition to the literature already mentioned, the children have their own official organ, the *Young Crusader*, edited by Miss Alice M. Guernsey, and published by the W. T. P. A.

Every State and Territory has now its Superintendent of this Department, under whose leadership thousands of women all over the land, whose labor is unpaid save in the coin of Heaven, are giving time, strength and money to the work. As nearly as can be estimated the present number (1890) of Loyal Temperance Legion Companies is 3,976, with a total pledged membership of 200,000 boys and girls, representing every sect, color and nationality. All wear the L. T. L. badge, and march under the L. T. L. motto, "Tremble, King Alcohol, we shall grow up!" HELEN G. RICE,
National Superintendent L. T. L.

Lucas, Margaret Bright.—Born in Rochdale, Lancashire, Eng., July 14, 1818; died in London, Feb. 4, 1890. She was of the famous Bright family, of which nine members sat in the House of Commons; she was the youngest daughter of Jacob Bright, and the still more noted John Bright was her brother. She shared the enthusiasm for reform and philanthropy that gave so peculiar a distinction to these celebrated men. Like them she professed the religious faith of the Friends. In 1839 she was wedded to Samuel Lucas, of whom she was bereaved after 25 years of very happy married life. At the age of 16 she signed a pledge requiring total abstinence from all intoxicating beverages; and therefore she was one of the earliest adherents of radical teetotalism in England. She became a member of the Good Templar Order during her visit to the Social Science Congress at Plymouth, Eng., in 1872, and was chosen Grand Worthy Vice-Templar of the Grand Lodge in 1874, a position to which she was re-elected in 1876 and 1877. She was President of the British Women's Temperance Association and was the first President of the World's W. C. T. U. In 1886, when 68 years old, she came to America and attended the National Convention of the W. C. T. U. at Minneapolis. Her energies were not exhausted in the temperance work; she exhibited active sympathy for many other advanced movements, and was especially devoted to the Woman Suffrage cause. Possessed of considerable wealth, she contributed liberally and judiciously to charitable enterprises.

Lutheran Church (English Branch).—The General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, in session at Omaha, Neb., June, 1887, adopted the following:

"RESOLVED, That the right and therefore the wisest and most efficient method in dealing with

> the traffic in alcoholic liquors for drinking purposes is its suppression, and that we therefore also urge those who comprise the church which we represent to endeavor to secure in every State the absolute Prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage."

The last session of this body, held in Allegheny, Pa., June, 1889, contented itself with the following deliverance, limited to a single State campaign:

> "The General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States, in Allegheny assembled, in accord with previous deliverances of the Synod, bids the Prohibitory Constitutional Amendment in Pennsylvania God-speed, and hopes her members, in the exercise of their Christian liberty as citizens, will all vote for it.
>
> "RESOLVED, That the Secretary be instructed to send a copy of this action to all our churches in Pennsylvania, with a request that it be read from the pulpit on next Sunday, June 16."

Lutheran Church (German Branch).—Rev. F. Wischan, editor of the *Missionbote*, official organ of the German Lutheran Church, states that no recent action has been taken by the General Synod on the liquor question.

Madagascar.—See p. 13.

Madeira.—See VINOUS LIQUORS.

Maine.—See Index.

Maine Law.—Maine was the first State to adopt a rigorous general Prohibitory act. The measure became known as the "Maine law," and similar statutes that rapidly followed in other States were similarly named. The term "Maine law," though having a special application to the Prohibitory act of Maine, is therefore suggestive also of all the other kindred State laws passed before the Civil War (see p. 306). This article will be confined, however, to a brief review of the Maine law in Maine.

To Gen. James Appleton is justly attributed the honor of first outlining and publicly advocating, before the people and in the Legislature of Maine, the policy of State Prohibition. His work was begun soon after his removal from Massachusetts to Portland, and the most conspicuous development of it was the report in favor of Prohibition which he submitted as Chairman of a joint select committee in the Legislature of 1837.[1]

The first Prohibitory law—a crude and unsatisfactory one—was passed in 1846. The Maine law, properly so-called, was not enacted until June, 1851. It passed through all its stages in one day, the final vote being 18 to 10 in the Senate and 86 to 40 in the House. It took effect upon its approval by the Governor, which was on Monday, the 2d of June. It condemned all intoxicating liquors of whatever kind to be seized, confiscated and destroyed, if kept for unlawful sale.

The comparative ease with which this unprecedented legislation was obtained was due in no small measure to the manifestly great evils inflicted upon the populace by drink. At that time Maine was overrun with distilleries and breweries; there were seven of the former and two of the latter in the small city of Portland alone. There was probably no State where more liquor was consumed, in proportion to population. A sum equivalent to the value of all the property existing in the State was wasted in drink in every period of 20 years. Maine had two principal industries, lumbering and the fisheries. The products of these were sent mostly to the West India Islands, and the chief commodities received in exchange were rum and molasses. The imported molasses was converted into rum, and practically all of the ardent spirits, both home-made and foreign, was consumed in Maine, so that the State was never a dollar the richer for all this large trade. The wealth of the vast forests and of the fisheries was poured down the throats of the people in the form of intoxicating liquors.

The immediate effect of the law of 1851 was the entire suppression of the wholesale liquor trade throughout the State, and the abandonment of the liquor business by persons who wished to stand well in the community as honest men. Another consequence was the suppression of the manufacture of intoxicating liquors: there is not to-day, and has not been for many years, a distillery or brewery in Maine. The various municipal authorities, by public notice, granted to liquor-dealers a reasonable period of time in which to send their stocks of liquors away, though warning them to make no sales within the State. This concession was generally accepted in a spirit of becoming submissiveness. One liquor-seller refused to ship his stock—a large one,—and after some delay it was seized. A protracted lawsuit followed, but the dealer obtained no relief from the Courts, and besides losing his property he was ruined by the litigation. No lawsuits involving principle or right occur now in connection with the enforcement of the law. All legal and constitutional points are settled.

---

[1] Mr. Dow, the writer of this article, refrains from alluding to the chief influence in the original Maine law agitation—his own devoted, long-continued and self-sacrificing work. (See p. 158.) In that agitation the labors of all other persons were insignificant in comparison with Mr. Dow's. The public sentiment that made the enactment possible was the result of his untiring efforts; the law of 1851 was framed by him; its passage through the Legislature was due to his persuasion and energies. Wherever Prohibition is advocated the Maine law of 1851 is remembered as the first radical precedent, and Neal Dow is honored as its "Father."—EDITOR.

The retail liquor trade was immediately reduced to inconsiderable proportions, being continued only by persons without respectable character, on the sly and on a very small scale. Supplies of liquor were brought into Maine in disguise, concealed in flour-barrels, in sugar-barrels, in dry-goods boxes, in travellers' trunks, even in coffins, and in many other ways. The dealer in liquors came to be regarded by the public as an infamous person, the same as a keeper of a gambling-house or house of ill-fame. Another effect of the law was to render disreputable the public drinking of liquors. Intoxicants are now rarely if ever seen at public dinners; whatever the occasion may be, whether given by Boards of Trade or to public men, liquors are excluded from the *menu*.

In the old rum times, as already intimated, the people of Maine were very hard drinkers. Now the traffic is practically unknown in more than three-fourths of the territory of the State, containing far more than three-fourths of the population. Where it exists at all it is mostly confined to the cities, and there it is carried on, in nearly all instances, in a small way, with more or less secrecy. This is due entirely to certain defects in the law, that leaves to the "trade" a considerable margin of profit, which no Prohibitory law should do. To be thoroughly effective it should be so constructed as to make violations very unprofitable and very uncomfortable to those who persist. All the improvements that are still needed will come in due time, when the politicians are shown, by popular sentiment, that it is not safe to trifle with this beneficent system in any manner.

Before the Prohibition era Maine was not only one of the most drunken but one of the poorest States of the Union. The evidences of poverty were seen everywhere—in neglected farms, dilapidated houses, decaying fences and general unthrift. All is changed for the better. Maine ranks with the most prosperous commonwealths, saving as she does probably $20,000,000 (directly and indirectly) that would be squandered for drink if any system of license were tolerated. The people have sustained the act by overwhelming majorities whenever they have had opportunity to give a verdict upon it at the polls. The most striking evidence of popular support was provided in 1884, when the principle of Prohibition was imbedded in the Constitution by a vote of three to one. NEAL DOW.

[The editor is also indebted to N. F. Woodbury of Auburn, Me. For a digest of the Maine law, as originally enacted and as amended at various times, see pp. 306–9. For a further statement of the results of Prohibition in Maine, see PROHIBITION, BENEFITS OF.]

Malt.—The product obtained from a special treatment of barley or other grain. The cereal is first steeped in warm water for a period long enough to induce germination, when the growth is arrested by spreading and drying; then it is ground or crushed between rollers. The germinating process changes a portion of the starch of the grain to grape-sugar—a change that is an essential preliminary to vinous (*i. e.*, alcoholic) fermentation, and therefore to the brewing of beer, ale and like beverages. Theoretically malt may be made from any cereal, but practically barley is the only one employed for the purpose in this country; in some of the northern nations of Europe bere and bigg (which, however, are mere varieties of barley) are malted. Of American barleys those grown in Canada have hitherto been most esteemed by maltsters and brewers, and large quantities of Canada barley have been imported every year, the amount now imported averaging about 10,000,000 bushels.

Malting, though incidental to the brewing business, is an independent and separate trade; few brewers go to the pains of malting their own grain. According to the United States Census returns, there were in 1880 216 malt manufacturers in this country, with an invested capital of $14,390,441, employing

2,332 hands, whose yearly wages amounted to $1,004,548, using material valued at $14,321,423, and producing merchandise worth $18,273,102.[1] The following list of the number of maltsters, by States, was specially prepared for this work in November, 1890, by a leading New York firm:

California, 5; Delaware, 1; Illinois, 25; Iowa, 7; Kentucky, 7; Maryland, 4; Massachusetts, 1; Michigan, 9; Minnesota, 2; Missouri, 11; New York, 117; Ohio, 25; Pennsylvania, 23; Wisconsin, 12—Total, 249.

The largest malt-houses are at the West. One Milwaukee concern has a yearly capacity of 2,000,000 bushels. The chief malting cities are Chicago, producing annually between 8,000,000 and 9,000,000 bushels; Milwaukee, 4,000,000 to 5,000,000; New York, 4,000,000 to 5,000,000; Buffalo, 4,000,000 to 5,000,000; St. Louis, 1,000,000 to 2,000,000, and Oswego, about 1,000,000.

In the process of malting the barley undergoes a slight shrinkage: a bushel of barley yields only 0.84 bushel of malt. The malt bushel in the United States has a fixed weight of 34 lbs. About two bushels or 68 lbs. of malt are required to make a barrel of beer of 31 gallons.

Although malt is distinctively a brewers' material it is consumed in considerable quantities by the distillers also. The Internal Revenue records show that in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, 2,242,214 bushels of malt were destroyed in distillation, valued at $825,134.75. In this country Indian corn and rye are cheaper for distilling purposes, and are regarded with greater favor by the distillers, on the whole, than malt. But in Scotland and Ireland barley is comparatively more abundant, and barley malt plays a larger part in distillation than any other grain.

Malt Liquors.—One of the three great families of inebriating drinks, including all fermented liquors produced from grain. Knowing that the ancient Chinese, many centuries before Christ, manufactured intoxicants from rice, it is reasonable to suppose that they understood the brewing art, even if the opinion is accepted that the liquors generally in use among them were distilled; for fermentation always precedes distillation. Rice-brewing was also apparently practiced in ancient India; the drink called *sura*, mentioned in the Rig-Vedas, is believed to have been manufactured from rice.[2] But the discovery of barley-brewing is attributed to the Egyptians; it is claimed that they made beer from barley as early as 2,000 years before Christ,[3] and Herodotus, about 450 B.C., spoke of their barley-beer (see p. 227). References to the use by the Greeks of beer from barley appear in the writings of Æschylus (470 B.C.), Sophocles (420 B.C.) and Theophrastus (300 B.C.); Xenophon (400 B.C.) says that the Armenians had a fermented drink that they extracted from barley; Tacitus (1st century A.D.) alludes to the manufacture of beer by the Germans, and Pliny (living at about the same time) to its use in Spain and Gaul.[4] The Romans acquired the secret of beer-brewing and introduced it into Britain, where beer replaced the ancient mead (an intoxicant fermented from honey). (See "Encyclopædia Britannica," article on "Brewing.") In all modern nations malt liquors of different kinds have been prepared. Even among the native tribes of Africa cereals are subjected to fermentation and the resulting liquor is eagerly consumed.

The early grain beverages, though probably as strong in alcohol as those now produced, were manufactured by crude processes and could not be preserved from decay. With the general employment of hops (beginning in the 17th Century) and the gradual extension of chemical knowledge, it was made possible to keep the beer fresh for a longer time, and the business of brewing expanded rapidly. It has reached its largest development in Great Britain and Germany, and in the United States has made great strides. The quantities of malt liquors produced in various nations, and other pertinent facts, are given under the appropriate heads in this work.

Beer is the popular name for all the

---

[1] Apropos of the reliability of these statistics, see foot-note, p. 380.

[2] Foundation of Death, p. 4.

[3] Ibid, p. 18.

[4] All the several nations who inhabit the West of Europe have a liquor with which they intoxicate themselves, made of corn and water. The manner of making this liquor is sometimes different in Gaul, Spain and other countries, and is called by many various names; but its nature and properties are everywhere the same. The people of Spain, in particular, brew the liquor so well that it will keep good a long time. So exquisite is the cunning of mankind in gratifying their vicious appetites that they have thus invented a method to make water itself intoxicate.—*Pliny*, *Nat. Hist.*, xiv, 29.

ordinary malt liquors. In England most of the beer consumed is of a kind recognized in the United States as ale or porter. In Germany the beer is called "lager beer," and this is also the name given it in America. This beverage is distinguished by its high amber color, its bitter taste and the abundant froth that gathers at the top of the glass when it is drawn from the keg. The alcoholic strength of American lager beer averages from 3 to 6 per cent. Many of the imported beers are much stronger, especially the Bavarian. The chemical composition of common beer is given by Prof. E. A. Parkes, in his "Hygiene," as follows: One hundred ounces of beer contains 5 ounces of alcohol, 6 ounces of extractives, dextrine and sugar, 125 grains of free acids and 65 grains of salt. *Weiss beer* is a considerably milder drink than lager, and is fermented from the malt of wheat, with a slight admixture of barley-malt. *Small beer* also is quite weak in alcohol. To show the relative importance of beer manufacture in American cities, the following table is reproduced from the *Brewers' Journal*:[1]

Cities.	Sales for Year Ending May 30.			
	1884.	1886.	1888.	1890.
	Barrels.	Barrels	Barrels.	Barrels.
Albany, N. Y.......	359,203	367.960	376.178	393.707
Baltimore, Md.....	330.199	385.033	481,943	537.993
Boston, Mass.......	788.882	811.084	867.039	833.278
Brooklyn, N. Y.....	993.620	1,018.863	1,327.358	1.508.144
Buffalo, N. Y.......	308.964	365.635	462.985	492.873
Chicago, Ill.........	743.458	873.995	1,366.769	1,673.685
Cincinnati, O.......	855,532	871.876	1,089.002	1,115,053
Cleveland, O.......	266.934	241,847	332,155	356.284
Detroit, Mich.......	197,731	222,740	277,592	278.953
Louisville, Ky......	....	....	....	200.916
Milwaukee, Wis....	1,067,010	1,115.102	1,286,121	1.527.032
Newark, N. J.......	619,480	694,006	878,869	1,003,524
New Orleans, La...	....	....	....	206,121
New York City.....	3,474.314	3,662,214	4,244,791	4,257.978
Philadelphia, Pa...	1,157.728	1,306,405	1.409.478	1,458.846
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	200.375	195.541	304.304	338.387
Rochester, N. Y....	288.138	289.582	341.796	427.533
San Francisco, Cal.	332.620	353,260	407.675	479.217
St. Louis, Mo......	1,061,765	1,079,392	1,407,744	1,613.215
Syracuse, N. Y.....	....	....	....	202.870
Toledo, O..........	205,163	200,405	236,805	246.488
Troy, N. Y.........	....	....	....	194,447

Ale contains a smaller percentage of hops than lager beer, is of a paler color and sweeter taste, and does not produce so high or so persistent a froth. Originally ale was the sole name given to malt liquors by the English; and the old British statutes invariably described the places where these liquors were sold as "ale-houses." The word "beer" was at first applied to the malt beverages prepared with hops, to distinguish them from ale, in the manufacture of which no hops were then used. The amount of alcohol in ales averages higher than in American beers, being generally in excess of 6 per cent. The most celebrated ales are those brewed in Ireland, England and Scotland. The establishment of Guinness & Co. (Dublin, Ireland) produced in 1889 2,122,860 barrels (American measurement) of malt liquors. The brewery of Bass, Ratcliff, Gretton & Co., Limited (Burton on Trent, Eng.), manufactured more than 1,000,000 barrels; and upward of 500,000 barrels each were made by these four concerns: Allsop & Sons, Limited (Burton on Trent), Coombes & Co. (London), Truman, Hanbury & Buxton (London) and Barclay & Perkins (London).[2] Draught ale is not an article of large consumption in the United States except in a few Eastern cities. There is no means of determining the exact quantity made in this country, since the official returns make no distinction between the different kinds of malt liquors. But several ale breweries are located in the States of New York and New Jersey, and there are a few in other States.

Porter is a black, bitter, peculiarly flavored beer. The percentage of alcohol in it is about the same as in ordinary lager. It is brewed from a pale or amber malt, with which is mixed a certain percentage of roasted malt. The latter imparts the dark color as well as the burnt taste of the liquor. Porter was first made in 1722 by Harwood, a London brewer, and its popularity among the porters and laboring classes gave it its name. Enormous quantities are drank in England, but in the United States it is one of the less important beverages, although wherever ale is made and sold porter is in request.

Stout, or *brown stout*, is a variety of porter, stronger and richer than the common stuff. It, too, is an English drink, and there is very little demand for it outside the British Isles.

[See also ADULTERATION, CONSUMPTION OF LIQUORS and LIGHT LIQUORS.]

---

[1] The figures include malt liquors of all kinds—ales, porters, etc., as well as lager beer.

[2] These quantities, however, stand for porter and ston as well as ale.

Mann, Horace.—Born in Franklin, Mass., May 4, 1796; died in Yellow Springs, O., Aug. 2, 1859. At the age of 13 he lost his father, who was a poor farmer. His childhood and youth were passed in great poverty; he earned his own schoolbooks by braiding straw, and from his tenth to his twentieth year there was no year in which he was able to secure more than six weeks of schooling. As a lad, he writes, he "formed the resolution to be a slave of no habit," never used tobacco and was never under the influence of liquor. His savings enabled him to employ a competent tutor, and in 1816 he entered the sophomore class of Brown University. He graduated in 1819 with first honors, and was appointed a tutor in Latin and Greek. In 1821 he began the study of law, and in 1823 he was admitted to the bar at Dedham. It is said that in the 14 years during which he actively practiced his profession he won four-fifths of his cases. His legislative career began in 1827, when he was chosen a member of the lower House of the Massachusetts Legislature; and for 10 years he served continuously in one branch or the other of that body, ultimately becoming President of the Senate. During this period he exhibited a lively interest in the cause of reform legislation, and especially in behalf of temperance, anti-lottery and educational measures. In 1830 he stood alone in the Legislature for a statute prohibiting Sunday sales of liquor; for at that time the liquor laws of Massachusetts still permitted selling on Sunday. Seven years later, while he was President of the Senate, the Sunday law was passed; and in a letter to a friend, while exulting over the victory, he declared that it was merely a step and not an end.

"You asked me," he wrote, "some time since, what I meant by the triumph of the temperance reform, and whether we must not always see excess. What I meant by the triumph of the temperance reform was the entire Prohibition of the sale of ardent spirits as a drink, the abrogation of the laws authorizing the existence of public places for its use or sale—thus taking away those frequent temptations to men whose appetites now overcome their resolutions. There are thousands and tens of thousands of inebriates who never would have been so had the tavern and the dramshop been five miles off from their homes." [1]

In his "Journal," May 26, 1837, he wrote:

"The annual meeting of the Massachusetts Temperance Society took place this evening. Pretty well attended, and some good speeches made. The cause progresses. I used to feel a faith in its ultimate triumph, as strong as prophecy. The faith is now in a forward state of realization; and what a triumph it will be! Not like a Roman triumph that made hearts bleed and nations weep, and reduced armies to captivity, but one that heals hearts and wipes tears from a nation's eyes, and sets captivity free." [2]

He became Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education on June 30, 1837, and for more than 11 years he devoted himself to improving the public school system of the State and promoting the interests of education in general. In this work he acquired a great reputation. In 1843 he visited Europe, and his study of the school systems of foreign countries led to the publication of a very valuable report. In 1844 he induced the State to found Normal Schools, though he had to make contributions from his private purse.

In 1848 he was elected to Congress as a Whig to succeed John Quincy Adams. His first speech in that body was a plea for the exclusion of slaves from the Territories. His anti-slavery aggressiveness led to a quarrel with Daniel Webster, and by Webster's influence he was defeated for re-nomination in 1850. But he appealed to the people as an independent anti-slavery candidate and was reelected. In 1852 he was nominated for Governor of Massachusetts by the Free Democracy (Free-Soilers), but was beaten. He then became President of Antioch College at Yellow Springs, O., retaining the position until his death. His labors here were earnest and progressive, but his efforts to build up the institution were counteracted by the gross financial mismanagement of his associates.

Mr. Mann's early enthusiasm for radical temperance legislation was not modified in his later years. He was a pronounced Prohibitionist to the last. In a letter written from Washington, May 18, 1852, he said:

"Another great moral question is profoundly agitating the people of the Northern and Eastern States: it is the question of temperance. Between one and two years ago such a concentration and pressure of influence was brought to bear upon the Legislature of the State of Maine that though it is said that body was principally composed of anti-temperance men, yet it passed what has now become famous in the moral history of mankind—the Maine liquor law. Its grand features are the search for and the seizure of all intoxicating liquors, and their destruction when adjudicated to have been kept for sale. It goes upon the ground that the Government cannot knock a human passion or a depraved and diseased appetite upon the head, but it can knock a barrel of whiskey or rum upon the head, and thus prevent the gratification of the passion or appetite; and after a time the unfed appetite or passion will die out."[1]

---

[1] "Life of Horace Mann," by Mary Mann (Boston, 1865), p. 56.

[2] Ibid, pp. 71-2.

Among his published works are: "A Few Thoughts for a Young Man" (1850); "Slavery: Letters and Speeches" (1851); "Powers and Duties of Woman" (1853); "Sermons" (1861); "Lectures, and Annual Reports on Education" (1867), and "Annual Reports on Education" (1868).

Marsh, John.—Born in Wethersfield, Conn., April 2, 1788; died in Brooklyn, N. Y., Aug. 5, 1868. At a 4th of July celebration he became intoxicated, but one such experience was sufficient to make him an abstainer. Upon finishing a course of study at Yale College he fitted himself for the ministry, and in 1809 he began preaching. In 1818 he was installed pastor of the Congregational Church at Haddam, Conn., where he remained for 14 years. In 1828 he became one of the officers of a county temperance society, and the next year he was chosen Secretary and Agent of the Connecticut Temperance Society (organized at Hartford, May 20, 1829). As Agent he visited various parts of the State, addressing meetings, founding branch societies and collecting material for his first report, which was published in 1830. A temperance speech delivered by him at Pomfret, Conn., Oct. 28, 1829, entitled "Putnam and the Wolf," was printed and 150,000 copies were sold. In 1831 he was employed by the Baltimore Temperance Society to conduct a three months' campaign in that city and Washington. He left his church in charge of another and gave his entire time to the new work. One of the developments of this engagement was the famous temperance meeting held in the Hall of the National House of Representatives, Dec. 16, 1831. It was presided over by Lewis Cass, and among the speakers were Daniel Webster, ex-President John Quincy Adams, Senators Theodore Frelinghuysen and Felix Grundy and Representatives J. M. Wayne and Isaac C. Bates. Mr. Marsh was one of the 440 delegates, representing 21 States, who comprised the first National Temperance Convention that met in Philadelphia, May 24, 1833, and he was a Secretary of that body. During the same year he was appointed Agent for the American Temperance Society, with headquarters in Philadelphia. The second National Convention, at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., Aug. 4, 1836 (364 delegates being in attendance, and Mr. Marsh being Secretary), reorganized the Society and gave it the new name of the American Temperance Union. The headquarters were continued at Philadelphia and a pledge requiring total abstinence from all intoxicating beverages was adopted. Mr. Marsh was the Corresponding Secretary and editor. He had already prepared six reports (1831–6, inclusive), which were republished in a volume entitled "The Permanent American Temperance Documents." The Union issued two periodicals, called the *Journal of the American Temperance Union* and the *Youths' Temperance Advocate*, of which 60,000 and 160,000 copies, respectively, were issued at the time of Dr. Marsh's twenty-ninth (and last) annual report. His work during his connection with the American Temperance Union was so conspicuous and devoted that James A. Briggs declared in 1865: "Dr. John Marsh for the last 25 years has *been* the American Union—its body, its soul, its spirit, its President, its Executive Committee, its energy and its everything." His active labors came to an end in 1865, when the Union was replaced by the National Temperance Society. During the Civil War he made great efforts in behalf of temperance among the soldiers of the United States Army, and in 1861 270 regiments were supplied with temperance tracts through his exertions. Besides numberless reports, tracts and pamphlets he published a "Temperance Hymn-Book and Minstrel" (1841); "Epitome of Ecclesiastical History" (1838; 16th ed., 1867); "Half Century Tribute to the Cause of Temperance" (1851); "The Temperance Speaker" (1860); "Temperance Recollections—an Autobiography" (1866), and "Prayer from Plymouth Pulpit" (1867).

---

[1] Ibid, pp. 364–5.

Maryland.—See Index.

Massachusetts.—See Index.

Mathew, Theobald. — Born at Thomastown House, near Cashel, Ireland, Oct. 10, 1790; died in Queenstown, Ireland, Dec. 8, 1856. He was educated for the priesthood in the Roman Catholic Church, spending a year at the celebrated college at Maynooth, Ireland, which he entered Sept. 10, 1807, and completing his studies at Dublin. In 1814 he was ordained. He engaged in mission work at Kilkenny, where he joined the Capuchins. Removing to Cork he shared for many years the labors of Father Donovan in a humble mission. Here he established a female industrial school, a night-school for boys and little children (the pupils numbering 500 in 1824), and a library and reading-rooms. His eloquent sermons and the wisdom of his counsels in the confessional won for him a wide popularity. Throughout the cholera epidemic of 1832 he was a faithful attendant in one of the largest hospitals of Cork, having requested, "as a favor," that the hours of his service should be from midnight to 6 in the morning, when he would be exposed to the greatest danger from contagion. For several years he was one of the Governors of the House of Industry—the Cork workhouse,—and in his frequent visits to the inmates he won the friendship of another of the Governors, William Martin, an old Quaker, who, with two associates (Rev. Nicholas Dunscombe, a Protestant clergyman, and Richard Dowden) enjoyed local prominence because of their fanatically persistent but not very fruitful advocacy of total abstinence. In passing through the workhouse in company with the priest it was Martin's custom to point out some of the most wretched victims of intemperance, with the comment: "Oh, Theobald Mathew, if *thou* would but take the cause in hand!" After long deliberation Father Mathew sent for his Quaker friend one evening early in April, 1838, and requested him to assist in forming a temperance organization. A meeting was held in Father Mathew's chapel on the 10th of April, resulting in the formation of the Cork Total Abstinence Society, with 60 enrolled members, each of whom took the following pledge:[1]

> "I promise to abstain from all intoxicating drinks, etc., except used medicinally and by the order of a medical man, and to discountenance the cause and practice of intemperance."

In his address at this meeting Father Mathew said:

> "These gentlemen are good enough to say that I could be useful in promoting the great virtue of temperance and arresting the spread of drunkenness. I am quite alive to the evils which this vice brings with it, especially to the humbler classes, who are naturally most exposed to its temptations and liable to yield to its seductive influences. . . . If only one poor soul could be rescued from destruction by what we are now attempting, it would be giving glory to God and well worth all the trouble we could take. No person in health has any need of intoxicating drinks. My dear friends, you don't require them, nor do I require them—neither do I take them. . . . I will be the first to sign my name in the book which is on the table, and I hope we shall soon have it full."[2]

When he had finished the priest subscribed his name, exclaiming, "Here goes, in the name of God!"

The Society held frequent meetings on week-day and Sunday evenings and the pledge-signers multiplied with a rapidity far surpassing the fondest dreams of the most sanguine of the reformers. A very conservative estimate places the number enrolled at the end of the year 1838 at 10,000.[3] Many were residents of the surrounding counties, Kerry, Waterford, Clare, Tipperary and Limerick, and the distant County Galway—men who had come to Cork expressly to join Father Mathew's crusade. In August, 1839, the members numbered 21,780, and from this date the movement assumed huge proportions; the enrollments in August and September swelled the total to 52,707, and in October to 66,360. A brief visit to Tipperary resulted in obtaining many signatures, while the announcement that Father Mathew would preach a charity sermon in Limerick on Dec. 1 filled the city with such multitudes that standing-room in cellars, in which to pass the night, was purchased at two shillings. Father Mathew spent the greater part of Sunday, Sunday night and Monday administering the pledge; 17,000 names were recorded, and the entire number of pledge-takers was estimated at from 100,000 to 150,000. Two days' work at Waterford secured 80,000 signers and one day at Clonmel 30,000, while the growth of the reform at Cork was unabated. Of the effectiveness of the work no better proof could be adduced than that afforded by the Excise returns, which showed a falling off in the consumption of spirits in Ireland from 12,296,342 gallons in 1838 to 10,815,709 gallons in 1839.

---

[1] Dr. Dawson Burns's "Temperance History," vol. 1, pp. 137-9.

[2] Father Mathew, by J. F. Maguire, M. P. (London, 1865), p. 72.

[3] Temperance History, vol. 1, p. 139.

While these results must have been most gratifying to Father Mathew, it appears that from the first he cherished the hope that Ireland would be wholly redeemed from drink. He expressed this hope in an address delivered about four years after the origin of the reform at a festival in the town of Nenaugh:

> "This great temperance movement which we witness," said he, "was not lightly thought of by me; it was not the result of sudden excitement; it was not the impulse of a moment that induced me to undertake the share I have had in it. I pondered long upon it; I examined it carefully; I had long reflected on the degradation to which my country was reduced—a country, I will say, second to none in the universe for every element that constitutes a nation's greatness, with a people whose generous nature is the world's admiration. I mourned in secret over the miseries of this country; I endeavored to find out the cause of those miseries, and, if that were possible, to apply a remedy. I saw that these miseries were chiefly owing to the crimes of the people, and that those crimes again had their origin in the use that was made of intoxicating drinks. I discovered that if the cause were removed the effects would cease; and with my hopes in the God of universal benevolence and charity, reposing my hopes in the Omnipotent, I began this mission in Cork." [1]

The year 1840 was the most remarkable in the history of this wonderful agitation, and the results gained have no parallel in temperance annals. The principal cities visited by Father Mathew in this year, with the numbers of pledge-signers in each, were: Lismore, 25,000; Gort, 40,000; Ennis, 30,000; Loughreagh, 51,000; Portumna, 20,000; Kilkenny, 60,000; Enniscorthy, 25,000; Wexford, 26,000; Maryborough, 60,000; Athlone, 100,000; Sligo, 78,000; Castlereagh, 65,000; three visits to Dublin, 60,000, 72,000 and 46,000 respectively.[2] In the localities where he introduced the pledge (including the principal cities and towns in about two-thirds of Ireland) the effects of his work upon the liquor traffic were marked; many distilleries, breweries and public houses were forced to close, and the Court calendars were cleared of criminal cases. Lord Morpeth, Chief Secretary for Ireland, remarked: "The duty of the military and police in Ireland is now almost entirely confined to keeping the ground clear for the operation of Father Mathew."[3] The annual consumption of spirits, which during the years 1835 to 1839 averaged 11,595,536 gallons, fell in 1840 to 7,401,051 gallons—a decrease of more than 4,000,000 gallons, resulting in a loss of revenue of £500,000.[4] At the close of the first three months of the year 1841 the number of pledge-takers had reached a total of 4,647,000, and by the end of that year the number must have been at least 5,000,000 in a total population of 8,175,124 (Census of 1841). The number of gallons of spirits consumed had decreased from 7,401,051 in 1840 to 6,485,443 in 1841. The fact that this decrease, however remarkable, was not proportionate to the number of converts, is readily accounted for when it is remembered that under any circumstances a great many persons are bound to relapse from the best resolutions.

In 1842 the movement began to ebb, but tens of thousands were enrolled. The fruits of what had been accomplished were now enjoyed at their best. The consumption of spirits in Ireland amounted to only 5,290,650 gallons in 1842, a decrease of 1,194,793 gallons since 1841 and 7,005,692 gallons since 1838. The enthusiasm excited by these great achievements was shared by the most eminent persons of the day. In a letter to Mr. R. Allen, Dublin, written from Edgeworthstown, Ireland, Feb. 28, 1842, Maria Edgeworth, the novelist, said:

> "Beyond all calculations—beyond all the predictions of experience and all the example from the past and all analogy,—this wonderful crusade against the bad habits of nations, the bad habits of sensual tastes of individuals, has succeeded and lasted for about two years. It is amazing, and proves the power of moral and religious influence and motive beyond any other example on record in history. I consider Father Mathew as tne greatest benefactor to his country, the most true friend to Irishmen and to Ireland."[5]

During August, 1842, Father Mathew visited Glasgow, where 40,000 took the pledge. In 1843 Ireland was regarded as redeemed, and there was a huge demonstration in Cork, April 17, in honor of Father Mathew; but the Excise returns showed a consumption of 5,546,483 gallons of spirits, an increase of 255,833 gallons over 1842. A tour of England, made this year by the "Apostle of Temperance," as Father Mathew was now universally called, resulted in 197,940 pledges, 60,940 of them from London. In 1844 the consumption of spirits in Ireland was 6,451,137 gallons, an increase of 1,160,487 gallons over 1842. It was asserted that Father Mathew was making enormous profits from the sale of medals furnished to pledge-takers—each signer being charged 8*d* for his medal, if able to pay, or receiving one gratuitously, if unable. But this insinuation was found to be groundless, for the priest had impoverished himself for his work's sake.

---

[1] Maguire's "Father Mathew," p. 86.

[2] Temperance History, p. 173.

[3] Ibid, p. 174.

[4] Ibid, p. 175.

[5] Father Mathew, pp. 134-5.

In 1845–6, the years of the famine, the consumption of spirits advanced to 7,605,196 and 7,952,076 gallons, respectively. This increase greatly distressed Father Mathew. At Lisgoold, a village near Cork, he said:

> "I don't blame the brewers or the distillers—I blame those who make them so. If they could make more money in any other way they would; but so long as the people are mad enough to buy and drink their odious manufacture, they will continue in the trade. Is it not a terrible thing to think that so much wholesome grain, that God intended for the support of human life, should be converted into a maddening poison, for the destruction of man's body and soul? By a calculation recently made it is clearly proved that if all the grain now converted into poison were devoted to its natural and legitimate use it would afford a meal a day to every man, woman and child in the land. The man or woman who drinks, drinks the food of the starving. Is not that man or woman a monster who drinks the food of the starving?"[1]

In a letter dated Sept. 30, 1846, addressed to Sir Charles Trevelyan, he said:

> "It is a fact, and you are not to attribute my alluding to it to vanity, that the late provision riots have occurred in the districts in which the temperance movement has not been encouraged. Our people are as harmless in their meetings as flocks of sheep, unless when inflamed and maddened by intoxicating drink. If I were at liberty to exert myself, as heretofore, no part of Ireland would remain unvisited; but the unavoidable expenses of such a mighty reformation are now an insurmountable obstacle. Were it not for the temperate habits of the greater portion of the people of Ireland our unhappy country would be before now one wild scene of tumult and bloodshed."[2]

Father Mathew's reception in the United States, which he visited in 1849, reaching New York on June 30, was attended by official honors rarely accorded to a foreigner. In New York he was welcomed by the City Council in a body, and addresses were presented to him by the President of the Board of Aldermen and by William E. Dodge for the American Temperance Union. In Boston an address of welcome was made in the name of the City Council, and Governor Briggs attended a reception given in his honor. The Philadelphia City Council received him in Independence Hall. At Washington President Taylor extended a banquet to him at the White House, Dec. 20, and the Senate voted, by 33 to 18,[3] to admit him to the bar of the Senate Chamber—a mark of distinction that had been conferred on only one other foreigner, Gen. Lafayette. On this occasion Henry Clay pronounced a eulogy, in which he said:

> "I think it ought to be received as a just homage to a distinguished foreigner, for his humanity, his benevolence, his philanthropy and his virtue, and as properly due to one who has devoted himself to the good of his whole species. It is but a merited tribute of respect to a man who has achieved a great social revolution—a revolution in which no blood has been shed, a revolution which has involved no desolation, which has caused no bitter tears of widows and orphans to flow; a revolution which has been achieved without violence, and a greater one, perhaps, than has ever been accomplished by any benefactor of mankind."[4]

In 1851 Father Mathew returned to Ireland completely exhausted, after a tour of the principal cities of the South and of the Mississippi Valley made in spite of sickness and intense suffering. It is estimated that he administered the pledge to about 600,000 in this country. In his native land he found the fruit of his life's work gradually slipping away—

---

[1] Ibid, p. 317.

[2] Ibid, p. 236.

[3] This vote was not reached without protracted discussion, due to the action of the Boston Abolitionists, who after seeking vainly to obtain a statement from Father Mathew against slavery republished a circular, issued some years before and signed by Father Mathew and Daniel O'Connell, in which the strongest anti-slavery ground was taken. Father Mathew's desire to remain neutral on this question during his visit was in order that he might not prejudice the temperance cause or impair his power for usefulness as its advocate. The course of the Abolitionists proved a serious bar to his work in the South, as he had foreseen. (See "King Alcohol in the Realm of King Cotton," by H. A. Scomp, Ph. D., chapter 31; and "Father Mathew," chapter 35.)

[4] Father Mathew, p. 296.

the consumption of spirits constantly increasing; and his mature judgment of the means necessary for the permanent destruction of intemperance was expressed in a letter written to Rev. George W. Pepper in 1854, two years before his death:

> "The question of prohibiting the sale of ardent spirits and the many other intoxicating drinks which are to be found in our unhappy country is not new to me. The principle of Prohibition seems to me the only safe and certain remedy for the evils of intemperance. This opinion has been strengthened by the hard labor of more than 20 years in the temperance cause. I rejoice in the welcome intelligence of the formation of a Maine Law Alliance, which I trust will be the means, under God, of destroying the fruitful source of crime and pauperism."

Referring to the causes of the gradual decline of the Irish into their old drinking habits Dr. Dawson Burns says:

> "Added to all other causes, and greater than all, was the continuance of the legalized drink traffic in the midst of the converted millions. Though many liquor-shops were closed, sufficient numbers remained open to act as snares to the unwary, and as ever-present temptations in moments of weakness. Had the power been placed in the hands of the people of extinguishing these centres of evil and thus allowing time for the free and full formation of sober habits and of a stronger will, the results would have been widely different. No one understood this better than Father Mathew himself, who became a Vice-President of the United Kingdom Alliance in 1853, and recognized in its policy of the legislative suppression of the liquor traffic the necessary guarantee of all permanent temperance reformation."[1]

This statement is confirmed by a letter from Father Mathew addressed to the Alliance from Cork, Feb. 21, 1853.

> "My labors," he wrote, "with the Divine aid, were attended with partial success. The efforts of individuals, however zealous, are not equal to the mighty task. The United Kingdom Alliance strikes at the very root of the evil.[2] I trust in God the associated efforts of the many good and benevolent men will effectually crush a monster gorged with human gore."[3]

Medicine.—One of the most obstinate obstacles to a successful propagation of total abstinence principles is the drug fallacy—a delusion founded on precisely the same error which leads the dram-drinker to mistake a process of irritation for a process of invigoration. During the infancy of the healing art all medical theories were biased by the idea that sickness is an enemy whose attacks must be repulsed *à main forte,* by suppressing the symptoms with fire, sword and poison—not in the figurative, but in the literal sense,—the keystone dogma of the primitive Sangrados having been the following heroic maxim: "*Quod medicamenta non curant, ferrum curat; quod non curat ferrum ignis curat*" (What drugs won't cure must be cured with iron [the lancet]; if that fails, resort to fire). But with the progress of the physiological sciences the truth gradually gained ground that disease itself is a reconstructive process, and that the suppression of the symptoms retards the accomplishment of that reconstruction. And ever since that truth has dawned upon the human mind the use of poison drugs has steadily declined among intelligent people.

Alcohol lingers in our hospitals as slavery lingers in South America or torture in the Courts of eastern Europe. Quacks prescribe it because it is the cheapest stimulant; routine doctors prescribe it because its stimulating effect is more infallible than that of other poisons; empirists prescribe it at the special request of their patients, or because they find it in the ready-made formulas of their dispensatories. Observant physicians, however, are beginning to recognize the fact that virulent drugs can at best only force nature to postpone the crisis of a disease and interrupt the course of a process which, after all, is the safest and often the most direct path to the goal of definite recovery. The necessity of alcoholic drugs has been disproved by the strongest testimony ever accumulated on any medical question. Alcohol as a medicine can be rejected in favor of safer as well as more efficacious tonics; and that it should be thus rejected admits of no doubt, from a moral point of view, considering the facts that: (1) Fifteen per cent. of all confirmed topers owe their ruin to the after effects of medical prescriptions, and (2) A single dose of alcoholic drugs is sufficient to reawaken the dormant passion of a reclaimed inebriate or to kindle the fuel gathered by the transmission of hereditary tendencies. "I remember the case of a habitual drinker," says Dr. Mussey,

---

[1] Temperance History, vol. 1, pp. 398–9.

[2] The Alliance was organized avowedly "for the total and immediate legislative suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors as beverages." (See the paper by Thomas H. Barker, formerly Secretary of the Alliance, in the "Centennial Temperance Volume" [New York, 1881], p. 810.)

[3] Father Mathew, p. 330.

"who in an interval of contrition took a solemn pledge that he would touch no more spirits for 40 years, never doubting, however, that 40 years would place him in his grave. His health improved and he actually kept his vow, but at the expiration of the stipulated period ventured to take a little liquor, as it seemed no more than a friendly salutation given to an old acquaintance—and in a short time died a sot."

Alcohol can in no case be considered an indispensable means either of maintaining or restoring the normal condition of the human organism. "Alcohol is neither a food nor a generator of force in the human body," says Dr. N. S. Davis, ex-President of the American Medical Association, "and *I have found no case of disease, and no emergency arising from accident, that I could not treat more successfully without any form of fermented or distilled liquor than with.*" Dr. Andrew Clark of London, court-physician of the royal family, confesses that "Alcohol is not only not a helper of work but a certain hinderer, and every man who comes to the front of a profession in London is marked by this one characteristic, that the more busy he gets the less in the shape of alcohol he takes, and his excuse is: 'I am sorry, but I cannot take it and do my work.'" "The banishment of alcohol," says the editor of the Boston *Journal of Chemistry,* "would not deprive us of a single one of the indispensable agents which modern civilization demands. Neither would chemical science be retarded by its loss. In no instance of disease is it a remedy which might not be dispensed with and other agents substituted." Dr. H. E. Greene of Boston reminds us of an additional reason for renouncing the aid of the treacherous drug. "It needs no argument," he says, "to convince us that it is upon the medical profession to a very great extent that the rumseller depends to maintain the respectability of the traffic. It requires only your own experience and observation to convince you that it is upon the medical profession, upon their prescriptions and recommendations, that the habitual dram-drinker depends for the seeming respectability of his drinking habits. As a result of 30 years of professional experience and practical observation, I feel assured that alcoholic stimulants are not required as medicines, and believe that many, if not a majority of physicians to-day, of education and experience, are satisfied that alcoholic stimulants as medicines *are worse than useless,* and physicians generally have only to overcome the force of habit and of prevailing fashions to find a more excellent way, when they will all look back with wonder and surprise to find that they, as members of an honored profession, should have been so far compromised."

Felix L. Oswald.

The relation of the physician to the temperance reform is a subject of such importance that neither he nor the general public can afford to ignore it. There can be no doubt that the frequent and free use of alcoholics in the sick-room has been one of the greatest impediments to the progress of this reform; and yet if this freedom of use is advantageous to the patient, if it meets the requirements as nothing else does, and if the secondary effects are desirable and satisfactory, the faithful physician will be slow to relinquish the practice even if the liquor traffic and the drink habit derive no inconsiderable support therefrom. On the other hand, if the use of intoxicants in the sick-room is largely empirical, the result of routine practice or a matter of convenience; if most serious secondary results do very often ensue, and if in most instances, if not in every case, other remedies will meet the indications quite as well or very much better, then not only as a reformer, a philanthropist and a good citizen, but also as a scientific medical man, he is bound to eschew intoxicants and substitute other remedies.

It is undeniable that many a man is tottering to-day on the brink of a drunkard's grave who can trace the origin of his drink habit to a physician's prescription, and who has thus suffered through all his subsequent career from a so-called remedy which his doctor prescribed when he was sick. Here, then, is a risk which the judicious physician will not fail to consider, and he will give the preference to remedies that are quite as efficient in primary results and less dangerous in secondary.

Physicians have without doubt frequently administered alcoholics with a view to their food value; but the uncontradicted evidence of all authorities is that alcohol is a poison. All our dispensatories and medical dictionaries—English, French and American—agree on this point, and probably all physicians will agree that a food is not a poison and a poison is not a food. The difference between these two classes of substances lies in their inherent qualities, and the one does not run into the other. But even if some degree of nutrition could be claimed for alcohol, we have in milk an article of positive and undeniable food value that is always at hand and never open to the objections that lie against the intoxicants.

It is also claimed by some that alcohol is of value as a heat-producer, and the fact that much of that which is taken into the system cannot be found by the chemist has given some plausibility to this theory; but after three years of careful experiment, Dr. B. W. Richardson expresses his full conviction that alcohol is not a supporter and sustainer of the animal temperature. Other eminent physiologists who have given the subject much attention—such as Carpenter, Aitken and Lees—fully agree with him; while the practical experience of polar navigators seems to settle the matter beyond a peradventure, for they have invariably found that the total abstainers could resist the extreme cold far better than those who attempted to warm themselves with intoxicants.

But the physician most frequently resorts to the use of intoxicants for the sick in those later stages of fever and other exhaustive diseases where the vital powers begin to flag and some stimulant seems to be indicated. The opinion has been quite prevalent, both in the profession and out of it, that under these circumstances the patient can be kept up or "run along" by the use of intoxicants—that these supply a stimulation suited to the exigencies of the case; but it now appears very probable, if not absolutely certain, that we have been seriously deceived here, as it has been shown that patients can be kept up and "run along" quite as well with other remedies, and it is now seriously questioned whether alcohol is in any proper sense a stimulant. It is universally admitted that in its secondary effects it is a paralyzer of nervous power. This is shown in the uncertain gait of a person under its influence, and it becomes more manifest in the obtuseness of nervous sensibility when one is farther advanced. In the light of investigations made within the last quarter of a century it is quite probable, if not certain, that its first effect also is a partial paralysis of the terminal nerves, whereby the tension of the capillary is so much relaxed that the heart's action is increased—not because fresh power has been given it, but because the normal resistance to its action has been diminished. If however the old theory, that the first action of alcohol is really that of a stimulant, is conceded, the wise physician will consider whether we have not in ammonia and other substances stimulants of greater value, and those that are free from the serious objections that belong to the alcoholics.

Any physician who would honor his profession and serve his patrons well must give to the non-alcoholic treatment that patient investigation and candid consideration which its importance demands, and then pursue the course which the broadest philanthropy and the most enlightened medical science dictate. JOHN BLACKMER.

However unsatisfactory the attitude of the medical profession at large may appear to be in the estimation of those who are in accord with the views expressed in the foregoing articles, there has been a very marked growth of sentiment in the last 50 years. The evidences of it are seen not alone in the uncompromising attacks upon alcohol made in many medical books of great authority, and in utterances from a multitude of eminent practitioners and investigators, as well as in the increasing favor with which total abstinence is regarded by leading medical journals, but also in important declarations, issued with much formality and representing the best thought of the profession.

Three famous "medical declarations" on the alcohol question have been put forth in England. The first was drawn up in 1839 by Julius Jeffreys, and was signed by 78 scientists of distinction, including Sir Benjamin Brodie, Dr. W. F. Chambers, Sir James Clarke, Bransby

Cooper, Dr. D. Davis, Sir J. Eyre, Dr. A. Ferguson, Mason Good, Dr. Marshall Hall, Dr. J. Hope, C. A. Key, Herbert Mayo, R. Partridge, Richard Quain, Dr. A. T. Thomson, R. Travers, Dr. Andrew, and Alexander Ure (the Queen's physician). It was as follows:

"An opinion handed down from rude and ignorant times, and imbibed by Englishmen from their youth, has become very general, that the habitual use of some portion of alcoholic drink, as of wine, beer or spirit, is beneficial to health, and even necessary to those who are subjected to habitual labor. Anatomy, physiology and the experience of all ages and countries, when properly examined, must satisfy every mind well-informed in medical science that the above opinion is altogether erroneous. Man, in ordinary health, like other animals, requires not any such stimulants, and cannot be benefited by the habitual employment of any quantity of them, large or small; nor will their use during his lifetime increase the aggregate amount of his labor. In whatever quantity they are employed they will rather tend to diminish it. When he is in a state of temporary debility from illness or other causes, a temporary use of them, as of other stimulant medicines, may be desirable; but as soon as he is raised to his natural standard of health a continuance of their use can do no good to him, even in the most moderate quantities; while larger quantities (yet such as by many persons are thought moderate) do, sooner or later, prove injurious to the human constitution, without any exceptions."

The second declaration was prepared in 1847 by John Dunlop, Esq., and signed by more than 2,000 physicians and surgeons, of whom a few were: Dr. Addison, Dr. Niel Arnot, J. Moncrieff Arnot, Esq., Dr. B. G. Babington, Dr. Beattie, Sir J. Risdon Bennett, Dr. A. Billing, Dr. John Bostock, Dr. Golding Bird, Dr. R. Bright, W. Bowman, Esq., Sir B. C. Brodie, Sir W. Burnett, Dr. G. Budd, Sir G. Burrows, Dr. W. B. Carpenter, Dr. W. F. Chambers, Sir J. Clark, Dr. Copland, Sir J. Eyre, Dr. A. Farre, Dr. Robert Ferguson, Sir William Ferguson, Sir J. Forbes, R. D. Grainger, Esq., Dr. Guy, Dr. Marshall Hall, Sir H. Holland, Sir Aston Key, F. Kiernan, Esq., W. B. Langmore, Esq., Dr. P. M. Latham, Sir J. McGregor, Dr. J. A. Paris, Dr. Peacock, Dr. Pereira, Dr. Pettigrew, Dr. Prout, Dr. Toynbee, Dr. Wilks, Erasmus Wilson, Esq., Dr. Forbes Winslow, Prof. Adams, Dr. Aitken, Prof. Alison, Dr. S. Begbie, W. Braithwaite, Esq., Dr. Buchanan, Dr. P. Crampton, Prof. Curran, Dr. Keith, Sir H. Marsh, Dr. Q. E. Paget, Prof. Pirrie, Prof. J. Reid, Prof. Syme, T. P. Teale, Esq., Dr. Andrew Wood and Dr. Wylie. This declaration spoke with increased emphasis in behalf of total abstinence, and did not hint at the necessity of using alcoholic drinks in cases of sickness. The following is the text:

"We, the undersigned, are of opinion: (1) That a very large proportion of human misery, including poverty, disease and crime, is induced by the use of alcoholic or fermented liquors as beverages. (2) That the most perfect health is compatible with total abstinence from all such intoxicating beverages, whether in the form of ardent spirits or as wine, beer, ale, porter, cider, etc., etc. (3) That persons accustomed to such drinks may with perfect safety discontinue them entirely, either at once or gradually, after a short time. (4) That total and universal abstinence from alcoholic liquors and beverages of all sorts would greatly contribute to the health, the prosperity, the morality and the happiness of the human race."

The third and final English medical declaration, written by Prof. Parkes in 1871, was signed by George Burrows, M. D., F. R. S., President of the Royal College of Physicians, etc., by George Busk, F. R. S., President of the Royal College of Surgeons, by a large number of the leading physicians and surgeons of London, and by 69 eminent practitioners, heads of medical institutions in various cities and towns of England. It is reproduced below.

"As it is believed that the inconsiderate prescription of large quantities of alcoholic liquids by medical men for their patients has given rise in many instances to the formation of intemperate habits, the undersigned, while unable to abandon the use of alcohol in the treatment of certain cases of disease, are yet of opinion that no medical practitioner should prescribe it without a sense of grave responsibility. They believe that alcohol, in whatever form, should be prescribed with as much care as any powerful drug, and that the directions for its use should be so framed as not to be interpreted as a sanction for excess, or necessarily for the continuance of its use when the occasion is past. They are also of opinion that many people immensely exaggerate the value of alcohol as an article of diet, and since no class of men see so much of its ill effects, and possess such power to restrain its abuse, as members of their own profession, they hold that every medical practitioner is bound to exert his utmost influence to inculcate habits of great moderation in the use of alcoholic liquids.

"Being also firmly convinced that the great amount of drinking of alcoholic liquors among the working classes of this country is one of the greatest evils of the day, destroying—more than anything else—the health, happiness and welfare of those classes, and neutralizing to a large extent the great industrial prosperity which

Providence has placed within the reach of this nation, the undersigned would gladly support any wise legislation which would tend to restrict, within proper limits, the use of alcoholic beverages, and gradually introduce habits of temperance."

At the International Medical Congress held at Washington, D. C., in 1887, the following, prepared by the editor of the *Voice*, was circulated for signatures; and although the work was not systematically done, or under favorable circumstances, the names of 78 delegates were obtained (including distinguished physicians from foreign countries), the list being headed with the signature of Dr. N. S. Davis, President of the Congress:

"In view of the alarming prevalence and ill effects of intemperance, with which none are so familiar as members of the medical profession, and which have called forth from eminent physicians all the world over the voice of warning concerning the use of alcoholic beverages, we, the undersigned, members of the International Medical Congress, unite in the declaration that we believe alcohol should be classed with other powerful drugs; that, when prescribed medicinally, it should be with conscientious caution and a sense of grave responsibility.

"We are of the opinion that the use of alcoholic liquor as a beverage is productive of a large amount of physical disease, that it entails diseased appetites upon offspring, and that it is the cause of a large percentage of the crime and pauperism of our cities and country.

"We would welcome any judicious and effective measures which would tend to confine the traffic to the legitimate purposes of medical and other sciences, art and mechanism."[1]

From all this it is perfectly plain that total abstinence is unqualifiedly recommended by the deliberate judgment of physicians so numerous and reputable as to be considered thoroughly representative of the profession, that the careless prescription of alcohol or liquors is solemnly condemned by them, and that they exhibit a distinct friendship for legislation against the beverage traffic. Individual doctors may dissent from their conclusions and even hold fast to the old-time practices of indifference or recklessness; but these "declarations" are absolutely unchallenged by the profession in general. No counter-declarations have been formulated. If alcohol were good for man, if total abstinence were injurious or unnecessary, if moderate indulgence were promotive of health in any way, surely such declarations as those printed above, issued with so much formality and aggressiveness, would not be permitted to stand as the representative utterances of the medical profession.

There remain two propositions, advanced by the radical anti-alcohol scientists, that physicians still seem slow to accept—first, that even if alcohol has a remedial value, its virtues lie wholly in the spirits at the basis of liquors, and therefore that so far as this substance is prescribed it should invariably be given in the form of pure alcohol and not in the disguised form of beer, wine, ale, brandy, etc.; second, that even pure alcohol as a medicinal agent may be dispensed with, advantageously or without serious disadvantage, in nearly (if not quite) all cases. But conservative prejudices are gradually giving way before the conviction that those who make claims for alcohol cannot consistently prefer the diluted drinks to the pure article when the sole aim is to obtain a therapeutic effect; while the epigrammatic saying of the distinguished Dr. John Higginbottom, that in reality "alcohol is neither food nor physic," finds confirmation in numerous practical experiments. The results produced in the London Temperance Hospital have received widespread attention. This institution was founded Oct. 3, 1873, with a view to treating disease without recourse to alcohol; and although its supporters struggled for several years under serious difficulties it has for some time been on a tolerably good financial footing. In 1889 it treated 5,390 patients, of whom 789 were in-patients. Of the 5,390, 2,844 were cured, 2,049 were relieved, 329 died, 127 were unrelieved and 41 still remained under medical care—making a death-rate of only 6.10 per cent. for in and out-patients combined, certainly a very low death-rate for a metropolitan hospital. The report of the hospital for the 10½ years ending April 30, 1884, gave the following statistics for in-patients treated in that period:

Total number admitted, 2,278; cured, 1,272; relieved, 850; died, 113; still under treatment, 43—average death-rate for the 10½ years, 5.05 per cent.

In the same period of 10½ years, 53 cases of typhoid fever were treated; and 47 of the 53 patients recovered. Of the six who died, five were non-abstainers, and the other one had been an abstainer for only six months. Indeed, it was invariably found that the patients whose ailments were most stubborn were non-abstainers. The results in surgical cases were no less remarkable than in typhoid fever cases. In the period from March 25, 1875, to April 30, 1884, Dr. Edmunds, of the hospital staff, had under his care 401 "surgical cases of such severity as to require treatment in the beds of the hospital," and in no case did he administer alcohol in any form; yet only eight deaths occurred—a mortality of but 2 per cent.

---

[1] See the *Voice*, Sept. 22, 1887.

Concerning the methods practiced in the Temperance Hospital, Mr. Axel Gustafson says:

> "Part of the success is due to the distinction of its medical staff, to the model character of the hospital and to the devoted ladies who superintend the nursing. But a large part of the success is undoubtedly due to the fact that alcohol is practically disused. The visiting physicians and surgeons are in no way tied with regard to the use of alcohol, if they deem it desirable to use it as a medicine. It is only stipulated that in the event of any such exceptional case they fully report the matter to the Board. As a matter of fact, alcohol has only been used in one or two experimental cases during these ten years (1873–84), and in these cases without beneficial results. As an article of food and as a pharmaceutical vehicle, the use of alcohol is formally excluded from the hospital." [1]

Mennonites.—The Mennonite Church has a membership of about 250,000 in the United States. Its newspaper organs and District Conferences have taken strong ground for total abstinence and against the liquor traffic, but the General Conference has not in recent years made a distinct record.

Methodist Episcopal Church.—This church, ever since its foundation, has manifested a strong interest in the drink question. The Wesleys were uncompromising opponents of drunkenness and drinking, and also of the spirituous liquor traffic. The rules formulated by them for the United Societies of Methodists in 1743 declared that all "members were expected to evidence their desire of salvation, first, by doing no harm; by avoiding evil of every kind, especially that which is most generally practiced, such as . . . drunkenness, buying or selling spirituous liquors, or drinking them, except in cases of extreme necessity." (See Wesley, John.) Upon the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America in 1784, the following was made a part of the minutes:

> "*Q.* Should our friends be permitted to make spirituous liquors, and sell and drink them in drams?—*A.* By no means."

The rule of Wesley was modified in 1790 so as to read, "drunkenness or drinking spirituous liquors, unless in cases of necessity,"—the words "buying and selling" and "extreme" being omitted. This less aggressive attitude of the church continued for a number of years. Even as late as 1812 the General Conference voted down (after it had been called up five successive times) the following resolution:

> "Resolved, That no stationed or local preacher shall retail spirituous or malt liquors, without forfeiting his ministerial character among us."

Radicalism gradually came into favor again. The labors of men like Wilbur Fisk were instrumental in bringing the church back to its first position. In 1836, 1840 and 1844 attempts were made in the General Conference to restore Wesley's rule; but although a very large majority in the affirmative was obtained in each of these years, the necessary three-fourths of all the elected delegates could not be controlled. The division of the church into Northern and Southern branches occurred in 1844. In 1848 the General Conference re-enacted the rule by a vote of 2,011 ayes to 21 nays. The Southern branch had already, at its first General Conference in 1846, declared that

> "From the high ground so early and long maintained by the Methodist Episcopal Church in her disciplinary provisions against drunkenness and the needless use of ardent spirits, it is doubtless expected by the lovers of pure morality that she continue to evince by every possible method, and especially in the expressions of her supreme councils, a decided and irrevocable opposition to intemperance, and that such unequivocal avowals be constantly sustained in the teaching of her ministry and in the uncompromising administration of her discipline; therefore
>
> "Resolved, That we recommend all the members of our churches to unite their efforts in promoting the great temperance reformation now in successful operation."

THE NORTHERN BRANCH.

The Methodist Episcopal Church, North, at its last General Conference, held in New York in May, 1888, adopted an extended temperance report (May 24), which endorsed and emphasized the following strong words contained in the address submitted by the Bishops of the church:

---

[1] Foundation of Death, pp. 210–11.

"The liquor traffic is so pernicious in all its bearings, so inimical to the interests of honest trade, so repugnant to the moral sense, so injurious to the peace and order of society, so hurtful to the homes, to the church and to the body politic, and so utterly antagonistic to all that is precious in life, that the only proper attitude toward it for Christians is that of relentless hostility. It can never be legalized without sin. No temporary device for regulating it can become a substitute for Prohibition. License, high or low, is vicious in principle and powerless as a remedy."

The report touched upon nearly all the separate questions of policy arising from the temperance agitation. On the subject of total abstinence it said:

"We renew our time-honored testimony in favor of total abstinence from all alcoholic liquors. The best modern science has irrefragably demonstrated that there is no legitimate place for alcohol, not even in the form of the milder liquors, and in however moderate quantities, in a healthy, living organism. This testimony of science has been independently confirmed by the impartial demonstrations of life-insurance experts, critically seeking sure bases on which to conduct great financial interests. Total abstinence is now fully vindicated as something more than 'a dietetic whim' or a fanatical craze; and we can accept of nothing less than this as security for personal safety and as the basal principle of the temperance reform."

Speaking of the rules of conduct that should govern individual Methodists, the following extreme opinion was advanced:

"We approve the action of the Lay Electoral Conference of California, condemning the raising and selling of grapes for the manufacture of fermented wine, and we think the time has come for a broader utterance upon this subject. We warn our members against raising and selling, not only grapes, but also other fruits, hops and grain, for the manufacture of alcoholic liquors, as inconsistent with the Christian profession, benumbing to the conscience and hurtful to the cause of temperance and true piety. These practices bring the church into complicity with the great liquor nuisance, paralyze our efforts and afford comfort to the greatest enemy of modern Christianity."

The political recommendation adopted by the General Conference in 1884 was re-affirmed (May 25), as follows:

"We are unalterably opposed to the enactment of laws that propose, by license, taxing or otherwise, to regulate the drink traffic, because they provide for its continuance and afford no protection against its ravages. We hold that the proper attitude of Christians toward this traffic is one of uncompromising opposition, and while we do not presume to dictate to our people their political affiliations, we do express the opinion that they should not permit themselves to be controlled by party organizations that are managed in the interest of the liquor traffic. We advise the members of our church to aid in the enforcement of such laws as do not legalize or endorse the manufacture and sale of intoxicants to be used as beverages; and to this end we favor the organization of Law and Order Leagues wherever practicable. We proclaim as our motto: Voluntary total abstinence from all intoxicants as the true ground of personal temperance, and complete legal Prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating drinks as the duty of civil government."

In some of its minor parts the report was not wholly satisfactory to the most radical Prohibitionists. There was a paragraph advising voters to labor for political reform through the caucuses and primaries; and since this was the only explicit suggestion concerning the method of political action, it was regarded by some as a hint that the enemies of the saloon might without inconsistency (in the judgment of the Conference) continue in affiliation with the anti-Prohibition parties. In view, however, of the above-quoted utterances, this indirect justification of a conservative course (if indeed it may rightly be interpreted as even an indirect justification) was deprived of positive significance. Another minor expression that occasioned regret among the radicals was embraced in that portion of the report which dealt with legislation; besides approving Constitutional Prohibition, the policy of "no-license votes under a Local Option regime" was favored. Local Option, as is well-known, no longer receives the undivided support of advanced temperance people.

The inferior Conferences uniformly advocate Prohibition and condemn license in the strongest terms, and frequently show a most aggressive political tendency. The following extracts from 36 recent Conference reports have been selected with impartiality:[1]

California (1888).—"We favor the abolition of the Government tax on intoxicating liquors as making the State and nation *particeps criminis* in the liquor traffic; and we are unalterably opposed to all measures that propose by license, taxing or otherwise to regulate the drink traffic."

---

[1] The *Voice*, Oct. 24, 1889.

Cincinnati (1888).—"As consistent and courageous Christian men, we must ever protest against any form of license which shall legalize the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages."

Colorado (1888).—"To license such a business [the liquor traffic] for the purpose of revenue, or for any other motive, is a crime, and the revenue obtained is the price of our brothers' blood."

Dakota (1888). — "Intemperance is a sin against the individual, the home and the State; and license, high or low, insures the perpetuation of this great evil. . . . We are uncompromisingly opposed to High License."

Des Moines (1888).—"We declare uncompromising hostility to the liquor traffic, and demand its unconditional surrender."

Detroit (1888).—"'License, high or low, is vicious in principle and powerless as a remedy.' . . . We will make every effort to secure its [the liquor traffic's] complete suppression by constitutional and statutory enactment."

Genesee (1888).—"We deprecate and resent the effort of politicians of any phase of political belief who would minify the utterances of the highest authority of the church to harmonize with their predilections, or who would magnify the meaning of the same for purely partisan purposes. The saloon must go. It is murderous. We are opposed to license. It is no remedy."

Illinois (1888).—"The manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors is the moral plague of the 19th Century. . . . We are opposed to all license of the liquor traffic, either high or low."

Indiana (1888).—"The peace of society demands not a modification but the overthrow of the whole traffic."

Indiana, North (1888).—"We favor nothing but uncompromising opposition. No license, no tax, but complete legal Prohibition, and that only."

Indiana, Northwest (1888).—"It is not the prerogative of civil government to 'frame iniquity by law,' and we look upon all legislation which is designed by any method to legalize the liquor traffic as being both inexpedient and wrong."

Indiana, Southeast (1887).—"We regard . . . complete legal Prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating drinks as the duty of civil government."

Iowa, Northwest (1888).—"We favor the unconditional and immediate abandonment of all revenue from the liquor traffic, in order more readily to suppress the business and put an end to the scandal of Government deriving support from the poverty, degradation and vices of the people."

Iowa, Upper (1887).—"There can be no compromise with the saloon."

Kansas (1888).—"Partisan friendship with the saloon must be accepted as hostility to the church, the home and all that is valuable in society. No party is worthy the support of Christian men that fails to antagonize the saloon."

Kansas, Northwest (1888).—"On no ground will we make peace with the traffic. The conflict must go on to the end."

Kansas, South (1888).—"We stand unalterably opposed to any measure that in any way looks to the supplanting of our Prohibitory law by any license system."

Kentucky (1888).—"No organization, whether social, political or ecclesiastical, should have our support in any form or manner that directly or indirectly favors license or taxation."

Michigan (1888).—"The church demands that this Government cease protecting the saloon by the baneful system of revenue and license laws, and forever prohibit this traffic within our borders."

Minnesota (1888).—"We in no measure accept the license system as a solution, to any extent, of this [liquor] problem.

Nebraska, North (1888).—"The liquor traffic being the greatest of all evils that afflict our land, it is the greatest of sins to consent to its license."

New York, Central (1888).—"We will not parley with the enemy, nor compromise with any policy which, under the guise of restriction, puts principle and practice at variance. It is not license, high or low, not restriction, so-called, but absolute Prohibition for which we contend."

New York, Northern (1888).—"We are unalterably opposed to all forms of license, high or low."

Ohio (1888).—"No system of license or taxation can be accepted as a settlement of the issue, and nothing short of the abolition of the saloons can ever furnish ample protection to society."

Ohio, Central (1888).—"We condemn as contrary to the law of God and the best interests of the State the licensing and taxation of the liquor traffic."

Ohio, East (1888).—"The liquor traffic can never be legalized without sin, and we will give it no quarter."

Ohio, North (1888).—"We denounce all systems of [liquor] license or taxation, high or low, State or national."

Oregon (1888).—"A license to keep open saloon is an unjust and wicked regulation of government; produces vice and corruption in society. The privilege to sin and ruin manhood and souls should not be sold at any price."

Pennsylvania, Central (1888).—"The legalizing of the liquor traffic is a violation of God's law and detrimental to the peace and prosperity of society and the progress of the church."

Philadelphia. (1888).—"High License is not a temperance measure. It is a trap adroitly set for timid and half-informed temperance men. It was originally offered and is now urged as a compromise by the influential political friends of the saloon. Their object is to kill the movement for Prohibition, and prevent the threatened annihilation of the liquor traffic. We pray God to open the eyes of those who have been deceived."

Pittsburgh (1888).—"We endorse the sentiment expressed in the episcopal address to the late General Conference in reference to the liquor traffic. 'It can never be legalized without sin.'"

Rock River (1888).—"The license system is essentially sinful; it affords no remedy for the evils of alcoholism, and provides for its continuance."

Troy (1888).—"License, both high and low, is wrong in principle, and instead of suppressing the enormities of the traffic provides for their continuance."

Vermont (1888).—"The licensing or taxing of the liquor traffic is wrong in principle and disastrous in practice."

West Virginia (1888).—"License, high or low, is vicious in principle and is no remedy for the evils of intemperance."

Wisconsin, West (1888).—"We believe it to be the duty of the State to declare this traffic criminal and to outlaw it as such."

THE SOUTHERN BRANCH.

The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at the General Conference held in St. Louis, May, 1890, incorporated the following words in its deliverance on temperance:

"We are emphatically a Prohibition church. We stand out squarely and before the whole world, certainly in theory, and for the most part in practice, for the complete suppression of the liquor traffic. We offer no compromise to and seek no terms from a sin of this heinous quality. We are opposed to all forms of license of this iniquity, whether the same be 'high' or 'low.' It cannot be put so 'high' that the prayers of God's people for its suppression will not rise above it, nor so 'low,' though it makes its bed in hell, that the shrieks of the souls lost through its accursed agency will not descend beneath it."

In its Discipline, this provision appears:

"Let all our preachers and members faithfully observe our General Rules, which forbid 'drunkenness, or drinking spirituous liquors, except in cases of necessity.' In cases of drunkenness let the Discipline be administered as in cases of immorality, drunkenness being a crime expressly forbidden in the word of God. In cases of drinking, except in cases of necessity, let the Discipline be administered as for imprudent or improper conduct. Let all our preachers and members abstain from the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors to be used as a beverage; and if any shall engage in such manufacture or sale, let the Discipline be administered as in case of imprudent or improper conduct."

Methodist Protestant Church.—The General Conference, held in 1890, declared, in part:

"We rejoice in the success of any effort and any measure used to cripple and finally destroy the traffic in alcoholic drinks, and will gladly join in any effort for its restriction which will not compromise our Christian character; but as every form of so called 'restriction' by license or taxation tends to entrench the traffic behind the cupidity of the tax-payer and renders us *partes participens* to the crime of its continuance, we therefore believe that the only successful way of destroying this hydra-headed monster is by Constitutional Prohibition, State and national; and that the only efforts in which we as Christian people can engage are those which look toward this end; therefore

"Resolved, That we are unalterably opposed to any form of license, high or low, as being wrong in principle and pernicious in practice.

"Resolved, That any minister or member who makes, buys, sells, or signs a petition for license to sell, uses, or gives to others as a beverage any spirituous or malt liquors, is guilty of immorality and shall be dealt with accordingly.

"Resolved, We believe the time has fully come when Christian men should rise above party prejudice and sectional jealousy and give their suffrages to any party which has for its object the protection of our homes by the destruction of the unholy traffic."

Mexico.—The peculiar conditions of Mexican life, the vast tracts of territory over which there is but little Governmental control, and the consequent lack of system and completeness in statistical reports, render difficult the collection of exact information regarding the drink habits of the people. Briefly, it may be said that the use of intoxicants is almost universal, and to this cause, perhaps as much as to any other, is to be attributed the low condition of the inferior classes of that country.

The principal liquors used are pulque, mescal, aguardiente, mishla, ulung, pesso, caraca, acchioc, beer and imported wines, whiskey and brandy. Pulque is the national drink and the national curse of the aboriginal races, and of those people descended from the ancient occupants of the soil. The upper classes in Mexico use it less, choosing rather the costlier beverages that are imported. Pulque is made from the maguey plant, or American aloe, which reaches great perfection on the high table-land of the Republic. In central and Southern Mexico it can be seen growing wild upon the mountains, springing up in uncultivated places and spreading over large tracts of country where it is cultivated with great diligence. It does well in both rich and poor soils, being often found where nothing else will grow. The plant itself is extremely useful to the Mexican, its fibre furnishing him with thread, cloth, bagging, ropes, paper, brooms, white-wash brushes, scrubbing-brushes and combs for the hair. But its chief value, in the eyes of the native, arises from the intoxicating liquid it produces so bounteously. The plant soon after it reaches its tenth year puts forth a blossom, which, if not interfered with, shoots up to a height of 15 or 20 feet and crowns itself with a cluster of beautiful flowers. Such is the century plant, or *agave Americana.* But the cultivator who is on the watch for the blossom, at its appearing cuts from it its heart, leaving an open basin or cavity in the plant, into which a sap exudes, milky in appearance and containing when fermented water, gluten and alcohol. It has the taste of sour buttermilk or spoiled beer. From four to eight pints per day are taken from each plant, for a period of two or three months. To extract this fluid from the cavity into which it has run, the Mexican uses a long hollow gourd perforated at each end, and sucks it full of the liquor, which he empties into a pigskin carried on the shoulders. To convert the juice or "honey-water" into pulque, all that is necessary is to put into it a little of the same material that has been permitted to become sour, and fermentation soon takes place. So sensitive is the liquor to the presence of any foreign substance that a pinch of salt dropped into one of the bottles will, in time, ruin the product of an entire plantation. The laws against adulteration are very stringent.

The pulque is seldom sold at wholesale. Each plantation seeks to have its own shops in town. In these the stuff is dispensed to throngs of peons, Indians and the laboring classes generally, while jars and bottles filled with it are carried away for home consumption. In the city of Mexico nearly 300,000 pints of pulque are consumed daily by a population of 330,000. The revenue derived by the Government from its sale in the three cities of Mexico, Puebla and Toluca is over $900,000. The consumer pays for it from 6 to 25 cents a quart. In the large cities of Southern Mexico the pulque is to a great extent responsible for the gambling, drunkenness and fighting that prevail, the use of the knife being very common. The police report for the city of Mexico for the year 1888 gave the following figures, in round numbers: 400 pulque-shops open, yielding a revenue to the city Government of $75,000; 8 breweries in operation (the beer from which is sold mostly to foreigners, Americans and Germans); 600 grocers' shops, in which liquor is sold by the drink, yielding a revenue to the city Government of about $30,000; 140 cafés, eating-houses and "fondas," which pay to the city about $5,000 annually. The arrests for the year were: 221 men and youth and 180 women for disorderly conduct; 1,270 men and 1,941 women for excessive drinking (lying in the gutter, or reeling in the public parks); 401 men and 122 women for robbery; 191 men and 87 women on suspicion of being concerned in housebreaking and petty larceny; 131 men and 27 women as pickpockets; 31 men and 4 women for murder; 800 men and 276 women for assault and battery, resulting in wounds; 271 men and 91 women for carrying forbidden weapons; 40 men who had escaped from prison; 60 persons for false pretences; 371 men and 421 women for adultery and fornication; 320 men and 327 women for violations of public decency; 70 delinquent youth to the House of Correction. These figures do not begin to number the brawls, knife-fights, etc., at the pulque-shops and in the vicinity of the bull-rings, in which both men and women engage.

There are no laws to restrict the traffic, excepting those requiring each seller to obtain a license. The pulque-shops, however, must be closed at 6 o'clock in the evening, and few attempts are made to violate the statute. The restaurants, gilded barrooms, etc., where the higher-priced liquors are sold, remain open, the poverty of the lower classes debarring their entrance. No figures are obtainable to show the revenue derived from the sale of imported liquors.

Mescal is a liquor that is obtained from the fleshy and white portion of the maguey leaves. It resembles Holland gin and is much used in Northern Mexico, where pulque cannot be had. *Tequila* is another liquor produced from the maguey in the district of that name.

It is said to have the flavor of Scotch whiskey.

In Yucatan a favorite drink is *mishla,* prepared from the roots of the cassava plant; other fermented drinks are made from bananas and pineapples. Young women chew the roots of the cassava and mix the spittle with cold water, allowing the whole to ferment. Plantains are kneaded in warm water and allowed to stand until the mixture ferments. *Ulung* is made from powdered cocoa and sugar-cane; the *pesso* from lime-rinds, corn and honey. The cocoa-nut palm yields monthly a large quantity of liquor known as *caraca,* resembling the toddy of India. Its seeds, when crushed and steeped in hot water, yield the *acchioc,* which is freely drunk by the inhabitants of Yucatan, Tabasco and Chiapas.

There is no work done in Mexico to check the universal indulgence in fermented liquors, except that performed by missionaries. An occasional newspaper article appears calling attention to the monstrous evils connected with the traffic, but thus far no real effort has been made to put a stop to the plague.

William H. Sloan.

Michigan.—See Index.

Minnesota.—See Index.

Mississippi.—See Index.

Missouri.—See Index.

Moderation.—The unsoundness of the moderation doctrine must be admitted upon due consideration, first, of the danger to one's self, and second, of the injury to others.

The danger to one's self is apparent. The poisonous effect of alcohol upon the human system, even when moderately used, is now generally conceded by scientific authorities. But the danger to the user would still remain even if alcohol were proved to be food rather than poison. In fact the direct physical effect of alcohol is its least alarming quality. The result that should make every moderate drinker turn pale with apprehension is the appetite which it engenders. Every draught taken is, without question, another step toward that abnormal condition in which desire passes beyond control and the victim becomes bond-slave to the habit. No medical testimony is needed as to this. It is matter of common observation. There are, it is true, among moderate users those who escape. Some are saved "so as by fire." Others maintain to the end the mastery of their inclinations. But the number annually passing from the ranks of the moderate consumers to those of the drunkards is enormous; and if the facts were known, probably it would be found that there is almost no one who, using intoxicating liquor at all, does not go beyond the limit that his own conscience and reason prescribe. Thus the risk that every moderate drinker incurs is very great. When the doctrine of chances is candidly applied, the odds he must see to be against him, and the thought of the fate that awaits him if his chances fail is enough to make him tremble.

The immorality of moderate drinking turns largely upon this element of risk. No doubt it is often the duty of men to incur risk. There are useful and praiseworthy callings in which the risk to bodily health and sometimes to moral purity is constant and often extreme. But needless exposure to danger shocks the moral sense. The man who recklessly leaps from Brooklyn Bridge or drifts over Niagara Falls in a barrel commits a crime, even in the eye of the law. His body, his life, is not his own in the sense that he may wantonly throw it away. The risk incurred is culpable in the degree in which it is unnecessary. When the use of opium to assuage intense pain has entailed the opium habit, the victim is less censurable than if, in thoughtless self-indulgence, he has become needlessly a slave. The sin of the moderate drinker is incurred by his willingness, for the sake of a passing gratification, to imperil his body and his soul. He cannot plead necessity, for the experience of the last 75 years incontestably proves that alcohol as a beverage is not necessary. Total abstinence has passed beyond the stage of experiment. Thousands of individuals and families, and not a few whole communities, have lived happily and well without intoxicating drink. He cannot plead that in his especial case the risk is not considerable. This no man can say beforehand. The power of physical and moral resistance can never be known until the experiment has been tried, and no intelligent being, in the presence of what is now known as to the nature and effects of alcohol, can be justified in trying the experiment. It is but to cast himself from a precipice in the hope that God or fate will save him.

The other consideration that imposes abstinence is that coming from recognition of the injury done to others. This involves the effect of one's example upon his family, friends and acquaintances, and his relations to the drink evil as it exists in society at large. Every moderate drinker not only imperils his own safety but throws the weight of his example in the scale against the safety of others. When these others are known to be peculiarly susceptible to temptation, or are in any way especially committed to his guardianship, his responsibility is immensely increased. There is nothing upon which the righteous indignation of the community more heavily and justly descends than upon a man's teaching vice, to children for example. The most deadly charge against Socrates that malice could invent was that he "corrupted the youth." No moderate drinker is free from this sin against the souls of his fellows. Even if he could be supernaturally assured of his own security, nothing can relieve him from blood-guiltiness in the cases of others. The power of example is more obscure and subtile than a physical cause, but no less potent. If one could administer some material poison to a friend which would unconsciously transform him into a dipsomaniac, such an act would be no more culpable than to lure him by the seductiveness of personal example to a drunkard's doom. The far-famed Mexican *toloachi*, or weed of madness, a few drops of the milk of which secretly introduced into your friend's soup act immediately upon the brain, producing at first violent madness and then hopeless idiocy, is a fitting illustration of the fatal influence of the moderate drinker upon the young and innocent. He is employed, whether willingly or not, as Satan's decoy to betray the weak and tempted to disease and death.

The same reasoning applies to society at large. The evil of intemperance stands to-day like the pyramid of Cheops amid the evils of the world. Especially in our own land, owing to climatic influences, the nervous temperament of our people and the skill and abundance with which alcoholic beverages are produced, the burden upon society has become vast and insupportable. No one denies the unutterable woes that the curse entails. The only question is as to how they may be removed. Experience has developed one thoroughly practicable and effective method, namely, the complete disuse of intoxicating drink. Alcohol as a beverage can, if all agree, be driven from the land. No great evil could come from such a course. Neither the public health nor wealth could suffer. To do without it has been proved, over and over again, to be perfectly feasible and perfectly safe. One thing only keeps the destroyer among us—the self-indulgence of the drinker. Under such circumstances the obligation to abstinence would seem to be almost boundless. The moderate drinkers of our land have power of themselves to staunch this stream of sin and woe. Without their patronage the traffic could not endure. To neglect such an opportunity, to heedlessly suffer such limitless good to escape, is incapable of justification. But the moderate consumer not only neglects the good, he encourages the evil. Every glass that he takes tends to perpetuate and multiply these miseries. He does what he can to maintain the drinking habits of community and make the use of the cup prevalent and popular. How can he escape the disapproval of his own conscience and the condemnation of mankind?

The argument for total abstinence is often presented in such a way as largely to rob it of its moral power. All things, it is said, are lawful, but not all things are expedient. Again, however right in itself the moderate use of intoxicants may be, it is well to abstain as Paul abstained from meat, lest the weak should be made to stumble. Men are called upon, not, in view of the danger to themselves and the injury to others, to perform a solemn duty, but for the sake of their too self-indulgent brethren, and from the standpoint of Christian charity, to surrender a so-called personal right. Temperance, it is admitted, is obligatory; but total abstinence, it is claimed, while perhaps commendable, is discretionary. But it is seriously to be doubted whether the temperance reform can ever be carried on the basis of such optional morality. Men need to feel the weighty impact of a divine obligation upon their souls. The case from Paul is by no means a parallel. If the eating of meat offered to idols had been fraught with such untold sorrows as the use, in our day, of intoxicating drink, Paul would have made no explanation of his abstinence: the reason would have been apparent enough. The tolerance of a foolish superstition for sweet charity's sake is one thing, the arrest of a mighty evil by the weight of one's personal influence and example is another. It is the moderate drinker who is chiefly responsible for the continuance of the liquor curse. The drunkard long ago parted with reason and self-control. He is the victim of physical disease, confessedly helpless and hopeless and, to a great degree, irresponsible. The moderate drinker on the other hand boasts of his balance, his ability to refrain, and then with intelligent deliberation incurs infinite personal risk, corrupts by his example his family and friends, and does what in him lies to perpetuate the evil in the nation and the world.

William Kincaid.

It was to the complete failure of the "moderation" plan as a means of checking the evils of intemperance that the total abstinence movement owed its rise. Both in America and the British Isles the first practical attempts in behalf of temperance reform were based on the opinion that abstinence (especially abstinence from wine and beer) was unnecessary, and that men could be made to cease the excessive use of intoxicants if sentiment against the abuse could be suitably developed. Consequently for many years the moderationists had the field of argument and effort entirely to themselves, and the temperance societies were founded on the moderation rather than the teetotal idea. Moderation therefore had a thorough and prolonged practical trial; and the results were invariably discouraging and almost uniformly led temperance workers to the acceptance of total abstinence. To-day there is in the United States but one temperance organization of any prominence that does not insist on abstinence; and this one, while permitting its adult members to choose the moderation pledge if they prefer, requires all who are under 21 years to abstain, and recommends abstinence equally with moderation to the adults. (See p. 81.) The influence of this organization counts for little in the general temperance work, although it is identified with a powerful and wealthy church. The attempt made by Dr. Howard Crosby some years ago to found a non-sectarian moderation society received so little support that it expired without accomplishing anything save a demonstration of the futility of such undertakings. However sincere the individual apologists for moderation may be, and by whatever arguments they may defend their position, they are looked upon by the temperance public as obstructionists; and while most people may be willing to view them charitably, few except those directly interested in the liquor traffic or those who take a pro-liquor attitude, find it possible to praise their judgment. Nothing, indeed, is more cordially welcomed by the liquor-sellers of America at the present time than pleas from respectable persons in behalf of the "moderate" and "temperate" use of intoxicants. This is shown by the eagerness with which they reprint and circulate articles and pamphlets from the pens of conservative clergymen, as well as by the generous remuneration awarded by the liquor organizations to all reputable men and women who have a desire to derive pecuniary advantage from their advocacy of "light liquors" and so-called "true temperance."

In the nations of continental Europe the abandoned programme of the early British and American agitators is being tested anew, and nowhere are there indications of a successful outcome, unless the increasing total abstinence sentiment is regarded as an indication of approaching success. Certain it is, there is no evidence that the moderation movement in Europe has had beneficial results in any instance. This is the more significant when it is remembered that the alcohol evil has been discussed on the continent by many scientists of great eminence, and thus much has been done toward removing the popular ignorance concerning alcohol that has prevailed for ages. Along with acceptation of the moderation idea goes inertness—that is the lesson taught by the existing state of affairs in every continental country. The restrictive measures of a certain kind that have been inaugurated in a few nations, like Sweden, Holland and Switzerland, are far beneath the standard of legislation in America, where the total abstinence doctrine governs temperance action; and the common aim of all reformers, to reduce the drink traffic and mitigate its sad consequences, has not been noticeably promoted by them.

Mohammedans.—Islamism, or the religion of entire resignation to the will of God, as the Moslems or true believers in Allah call their faith, founded by Mohammed, is professed by nearly 200,000,000 people in Asia and Africa, though only about 6,000,000 adherents of the crescent are found in Europe. Though the nurse of polygamy and slavery, and probably fitted only for nations in a state of semi-civilization, Mohammedanism is the promoter of temperance. The lover of mankind must feel grateful to the founder of Islam for his attitude toward intemperance and his clear and unmistakable prohibition of intoxicating liquors. It may be broadly affirmed that the law of the Koran concerning abstinence from wine is very generally obeyed, and that drunkenness in Mohammedan society is exceptional. In comparison with a certain phase of the so-called Christian civilization, Moslems have in this regard cause for congratulation and pride. The abundant testimony of many travellers in many centuries is nearly unanimous as to the general habit of abstinence from intoxicating liquors among the vast majority of good Moslems. The liquor which has been and is imported by millions of gallons into Africa and Asia is from the stills of Christian countries in Europe and America. The missionaries of the Prophet in Africa and the propagandists of Islam in the East Indies and other Asian countries make much of this argument of contrast. They point to the drunkenness among Christians and the traffic which they carry on among the natives to the destruction of the latter. They quote and enforce the teachings of the Koran, which explicitly forbids the use of wine as a beverage and which commands temperance as a positive and necessary virtue. From George Sale's translation of the Koran (Warne's ed., London, 1888, pp. 23, 85) we quote:

> "But they who believe . . . will ask thee concerning wine and lots: Answer, In both there is great sin, and also some things of use unto men; but their sinfulness is greater than their use."
>
> "O true believers, surely wine and lots and images and divining arrows are an abomination of the work of Satan; therefore avoid them that ye may prosper. Satan seeketh to sow dissension among you by wine and lots, and to diverting you from remembering God and from prayer; will ye not therefore abstain from them?"

The comment made upon these and other passages in the Moslem's bible, by Mr. Sale (pp. 95-6) is, as follows:

> "The drinking of wine, under which name all sorts of strong and inebriating liquors are comprehended, is forbidden in the Koran in more places than one. Some, indeed, have imagined that excess therein is only forbidden, and that the moderate use of wine is allowed by two passages in the same book; but the more received opinion is that to drink any strong liquors, either in lesser quantity or in a greater, is absolutely unlawful; and though libertines indulge themselves in a contrary practice, yet the more conscientious are so strict, especially if they have performed the pilgrimage to Mecca, that they hold it unlawful not only to taste wine but to press grapes for the making of it, to buy or to sell it, or even to maintain themselves with the money arising by the sale of that liquor. The Persians, however, as well as the Turks, are very fond of wine; and if one asks them how it comes to pass that they venture to drink it, when it is so directly forbidden by their religion, they answer that it is with them as with the Christians, whose religion prohibits drunkenness and whoredom as great sins, and who glory, notwithstanding, some in debauching girls and married women, and others in drinking to excess. . . .
>
> "Several stories have been told as to the occasion of Mohammed's prohibiting the drinking of wine; but the true reasons are given in the Koran, viz., because the ill-effects of that liquor surpasses its good ones, the common effects thereof being quarrels and disturbances in company, and neglect or at least indecencies in the performance of religious duties. For these reasons it was that the priests were by the Levitical law forbidden to drink wine or strong drink when they entered the tabernacle, and that the Nazarites and Rechabites, and many pious persons among the Jews and primitive Christians, wholly abstained therefrom; nay, some of the latter went so far as to condemn the use of wine as sinful. But Mohammed is said to have had a nearer example than any of these in the more devout persons of his own tribe."

It will be seen from the above that the law of the Koran is that of prohibition and not merely temperance. Providentially this feature of Mohammedanism has been a great blessing to a large part of mankind, and it should provoke Christians to the good work of at least staying the flood of intoxicants that issues from the distilleries in Christian lands for the bestializing of the uncivilized races of Africa and Asia.

WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS.

Montana.—See Index.

Moral Suasion.—All experience shows that moral suasion will never make the drink curse less, because the open saloon is a more powerful influencing agent than mothers' prayers, wives' entreaties, children's pleadings or reformers' arguments. No amount of outside restraining power will counterbalance the temptations of the dramshop when once a person becomes the victim of appetite. The reason is obvious. The will power of every slave of drink is weak. He is incapable of abiding by virtuous conclusions. His heart may be right but his head is all wrong. Hence though his impulses may be the very best, his acts may be the very worst.

From moral suasion work, as such, prosecuted for a century and longer, few permanent results of relative importance have come. There have been great moral suasion movements—Father Mathew, Washingtonian, Gough, Murphy, Ribbon, Gospel Temperance and Woman's crusades,—that have won hundreds of thousands, nay, millions, of temporary converts to total abstinence, and in the judgment of their enthusiastic promotors have even promised to sweep liquor out of existence. It is not undervaluing the good that has been done to say that while individuals have been benefited public policy has not been materially changed for the better, save indirectly. Father Mathew's moral suasion agitation, certainly the most widespread one ever conducted, did not apply to drink conditions in Ireland any lasting remedy. The Washingtonians redeemed no State from the license system. The Woman's Crusade secured no concessions from the Legislature of Ohio. The work of Francis Murphy is hardly to be reckoned as one of the factors to which the general diminution of intemperance, crime, etc., in certain political divisions of the United States at the present day is due. On the other hand those who have fought the liquor traffic essentially as a matter of public policy can point to decisive victories: by them Maine was won, and Kansas, Iowa, Vermont and the Dakotas, and through their efforts it is impossible to sell or obtain drink in many hundreds of towns and counties. Moral suasion has cultivated sentiment, spread education, brought new workers to the cause and created or strengthened organizations; but standing alone it has never produced lasting reform. A sterner method is necessary.

The saloon makes the drunkard. Shut a man up in a prison for a term of years and he will lose the craving for liquor. Let the manufacture, sale and importation of intoxicants be done away with, and the released prisoner will be able to lead just as temperate a life outside the jail as he did inside. But the chances are that if he encounters the saloon when he becomes free he will renew his appetite. The liquor-dealer has persuasive powers before which all the capabilities of the reformer must yield. He appeals to weak humanity through the attractions of his place. Missions, churches, ennobling sentiment and better judgment cannot compete with these attractions. The self-interest of the rumseller keeps him ever on the alert, while reform work is spasmodic at best. At every step the reformer meets discouragements, hinderances and rebuffs. Public approval is not volunteered to him with alacrity. He grows faint-hearted unless he has an indomitable will, great courage and never-failing faith. The saloonkeeper, moreover, is strengthened by a most respectable backing. Presidents are elected by his permission, Vice-Presidents become beneficiaries of his "trade," political parties move just as he wills, and even clergymen are not unwilling to fabricate expediency arguments that are especially delightful to his ears. Newspaper editors and legislators are prone to feel a higher esteem for the "boodle" of the rum power than for temperance statistics or Conference deliverances. The nation makes way for the rumster and his business much as a crowd does for a steam fire-engine rushing through the streets to a fire. Women's prayers, children's parades, Sunday-school songs and meek petitions to politicians will be disregarded so long as they are not re-inforced by an inexorable political purpose, skillful management and votes. The moral and educative agencies will not, however, be dispensed with, but will be multiplied with the adoption of more vigorous methods. More intelligent aggression means greater success; and with practical progress goes increased ardor all along the line.

ELIZA TRASK HILL.

Moravian Church.—The General Synod met at Bethlehem, Pa., in September, 1888, and among many other things bearing on the subject of temperance declared:

> "That this Synod re-affirms all its former recommendations and resolutions referring to the use of intoxicating liquors and the position our church has taken on the temperance question. . . . That this Synod recommends to the ministers of those congregations especially where the vice of intemperance in the use of intoxicating drinks prevails, to preach the Word of God with close and special reference to this growing sin, as the only remedy to effect its radical cure. That this Synod is opposed to all *traffic* in intoxicating drinks, and the *use* as a beverage of hard cider, beer, ale, whiskey, wine, brandy, gin, rum, patent bitters, etc."

Mortality.—The great influence of alcohol as a shortener of life is well established. (See LONGEVITY.) But the exact percentage of the total mortality for which it is responsible is at present indeterminate. Alcoholism as a cause of death is a factor in the vital statistics of all large cities; but under this head are included only a small proportion of the deaths occasioned wholly or in part by indulgence in intoxicants. Fatal illnesses due to intemperance, or accelerated or influenced by liquors, are reported by physicians under a multitude of names that give no suggestion of the ruin done by drink. This arises in part from the fact that most deaths are classified by specific disease-names which indicate the ultimate disorder but not necessarily the peculiar contributing agent, and in part also from the willingness with which many physicians respect the sensitiveness of drinkers' families and refrain from putting the humiliating truth on record. There is also a vast number of deaths from accident, violence, murder, insanity, suicide, epidemics, lack of nutrition, improvidence, etc., which, if the circumstances were systematically inquired into, would be attributed entirely to drink, or to drink more than any other cause.

But we are not without expert testimony indicative of the magnitude of mortality from alcohol. In another article in this volume Dr. B. W. Richardson, whose competence to discuss the subject authoritatively is admitted by all well-informed persons, estimates that there are annually more than 50,000 deaths in England and Wales from alcohol, this number being 10 per cent. of the total deaths, and that alcohol, as one of the causes of mortality, is "at the head of those causes."[1] (See pp. 25–6.) The eminent Dr. Norman Kerr has given prolonged and careful study to drink mortality, and in his "Mortality of Intemperance" (London, 1879) informs us that he began his inquiries "with the avowed object of demonstrating and exposing the utter falsity of the perpetual teetotal assertion that 60,000 drunkards died every year in the United Kingdom." In his "Inebriety" (pp. 379–82) Dr. Kerr presents his own conclusions and the evidence furnished by a number of men thoroughly qualified by their experience to bear witness. We quote from what Dr. Kerr says:

"It has been my painful duty to compute the mortality from inebriety within our borders, and the estimate which after careful inquiry I was enabled to lay before several scientific and learned societies was pronounced 'moderate' and 'within the truth,' and has never been seriously disputed. There is first the number of deaths occurring annually in the United Kingdom from personal alcoholic inebriety, which I reckon at 40,000. It is true that only between 1,400 and 1,500 deaths have been certified as arising from alcohol in one year. But it is well known that the figures of the registration returns are no criterion of the actual number of deaths from alcoholic excess. . . .

"I arrived at my estimate of 40,000 by taking the proportion of alcoholic deaths to all the deaths certified by me in the course of one year, and applying that proportion, with certain necessary corrections, to the total number of practitioners throughout the kingdom. This calculation I checked in a variety of ways. First, by taking the average of 17 years' practice, comprising 278 fatal cases. Next, by the summary of the causes of 232 deaths in the practice of 12 medical men, some located in cities and some in the country. Next, by taking out from the general mortality returns a certain proportion for alcoholic deaths in hospitals, workhouses, from violence and accident arising through drink, and for the alcoholic mortality among publicans, beer-sellers and licensed grocers.

---

[1] The Harveian Society report concludes that 14 per cent. of the mortality *among adults* is due to alcohol,—*i. e.*, about 39,000 in England and Wales, or 52,000 in Great Britain.—*Foundation of Death*, p. 266.

"Dr. Wakeley, M.P., late editor of the *Lancet*, and Coroner for Middlesex, afforded ample corroboration of the moderation of my figures. Of 1,500 inquests held by him yearly, he attributed at least 900 to hard drinking, and he believed that from 10,000 to 15,000 persons died annually from drink in the metropolis, on whom no inquest was held. Taking London as one-tenth of the population of the United Kingdom, this would give 100,000 deaths from alcoholic indulgence over the country. It is often impossible to elicit a verdict of alcohol-poisoning, or alcohol-acceleration of death, even when the evidence is strong. As the jury have often been neighbors of the deceased they are naturally unwilling to return a verdict reflecting on his character. Yet, owing to the gradual enlightenment of the public mind, juries are steadily becoming more alive to the truth and less reluctant to refer to alcohol. Even when both Coroner and jury are ready to acknowledge the facts as to the habits of the deceased, it is difficult to elicit the whole truth from the witnesses. I have seen inquests at which the medical testimony showed the presence of alcohol-poisoning, when the friends declared that their dead relative was a perfectly sober individual, but after the proceedings were closed admitted that he 'took far too much.' Dr. Edwin Lankester, F.R.S., Coroner for Middlesex, was of opinion that one-tenth of our entire mortality was the direct result of poisoning by alcohol; and his successor, Dr. Hardwicke, pronounced my estimate of the direct and indirect mortality from alcohol to be 'far within the truth.' Dr. Noble of Manchester believes that one-third of our disease is due to intemperance, and Dr. B. W. Richardson that one-third of the vitality of the nation might be saved but for strong drink."

In this summary Dr. Kerr does not include all the valuable testimony that has been furnished him. "Prompted by my friend Dr. Norman Kerr," writes W. Wynn Wescott, M. B., Deputy Coroner for Central Middlesex, "I have made an analysis of 1,220 consecutive inquests held by me in London, and I cannot refrain from making the results public. I am not and have never been a total abstainer or an advocate of that cause, so there need be no fear that the figures are exaggerated. Of 1,220 cases of deaths, including deaths from violence, sudden deaths, persons found dead and deaths with regard to which no medical certificate is forthcoming, 470 were infants, children and persons below the age of 16 years. These may be presumably removed from the list of deaths from alcoholic excess. Of the remaining 750 deaths, no less than 143 are recorded as being the result of chronic alcoholic disease, acute alcoholism, delirium tremens, suicide caused by drink, or of accidental death while drunk, or of accidents arising because of incapability when intoxicated—that is, one death in every 5.24. . . . Only nine of the cases were of persons under 30 years of age, and but 21 cases were of persons over 60 years old."[1]

Of course it is not to be arbitrarily concluded that these calculations and opinions may be applied, without qualifications, to the United States. If such a conclusion were adopted, and Dr. Richardson's 10 per cent. estimate were used as a basis, the number of deaths from drink in the United States in 1880 (taking the Census vital statistics as authority) would have been somewhere between 98,000 and 106,000,[2] and Dr. Richardson expresses the belief that his 10 per cent. estimate is "under the mark," —an opinion, so far as it relates to Great Britain, that seems to be sustained by the figures of other experts cited above. On the other hand it may be reasonably claimed that since the per capita consumption of alcohol is larger in Great Britain than in the United States, the ratio of deaths from drink must be lighter in the latter country.

---

[1] National Temperance League's Annual for 1889 (London), p. 111.

[2] The Census for 1880 reports 756,893 deaths. But this number (it is stated in the Census) represents only about 60 or 70 per cent. of the entire number of deaths in 1880.

Mr. E. J. Wheeler, in his very able work, "Prohibition: The Principle, the Policy and the Party," has undertaken (pp. 59-66) to compute the volume of mortality from alcohol by using the recent returns of the British Medical Association. He reckons, from these returns, that "intemperance kills between 30,000 and 35,000 each year in England;" and (after making generous allowance for the smaller consumption of liquors in this country) that "in the United States, Jan. 1, 1889, of sixty-five millions, there were nearly 2,500,000 of hard drinkers, 120,000 of whom die each year, and 30,000 of whom owe their deaths directly to intemperance." These estimates are the most conservative ones yet obtained, and if they are accepted in preference to others the number of deaths annually caused by the liquor habit will still be appalling. But, as we have seen, there is good authority for the opinion that they are too low.

In the *Voice* for May 8, 1890, were printed a number of valuable opinions from editors of medical journals, officers of medical organizations, superintendents of medical institutions, professors and practicing physicians—specialists who were consulted by the *Voice* solely with reference to their ability to give weighty opinions, and whose names were chosen with the assistance of the editors of two leading medical magazines. The opinions were in response to a series of explicit questions touching the influence of alcoholic indulgence upon mortality in cases of diseases of the respiratory system (such as pneumonia, pleurisy, asthma, croup, etc.), diseases of the nervous system (such as apoplexy, convulsions, epilepsy, menengitis, brain and spinal diseases), diseases of the digestive system (such as gastritis, peritonitis and diseases of the stomach, liver and intestines), consumption, urinary diseases (such as Bright's disease, and diseases of the bladder and kidneys), diseases of the heart and circulatory system, accidents, and in cases of surgical operations. The answers showed much variation, but the general tendency was to charge a heavy percentage of deaths under nearly all these heads to alcohol. For instance, Dr. Charles H. Hughes, editor of the *Alienist and Neurologist*, estimated that 15 per cent. of diseases of the nervous system, 10 per cent. of the diseases of the digestive system, 10 per cent. of the diseases of the heart and circulatory system and 20 per cent. of all accidents were due directly or indirectly to drink. E. J. Deering, President of the Medico-Legal Society, made these estimates: Diseases of the digestive system, 20 per cent.; urinary diseases, 40 per cent.; diseases of the heart and circulatory system, 20 per cent.; accidents, 30 per cent. Averaging the estimates given, the total percentage of mortality from drink would appear to approximate, in the United States, the percentage calculated by Dr. Richardson for England and Wales.

Mott, Lucretia, daughter of Thomas Coffin, was a pioneer Abolitionist, a leader in the earliest efforts to win equality for woman, one of the first to champion total abstinence principles and a preacher of celebrity among the Hicksite Quakers. She was born in Nantucket, Jan. 3, 1793, and was descended from the original proprietors of the island. Rugged qualities and self-reliance were a part of her inheritance and were strengthened by the associations of her childhood. Her father removed to Boston when she was 12 years old. Although he possessed ample means he sent his daughter to the public school, desiring that she should esteem herself no better than others. He also wished her to have a thoroughly practical training. When she had passed beyond the lower grades he placed her in a Friends' boarding-school in New York. There she met James Mott, whom she married at the age of 18. Her anti-slavery sentiments had already been moulded; sympathy for the slave had been aroused in her by the lessons taught in her school reading-books in New England and by Clarkson's pictures. Her experience as a teacher impelled her to advocate justice for woman; although she possessed a man's qualifications and performed a man's services she received only half a man's salary.

After her marriage Philadelphia became her place of residence. Here she found abundant work to do in behalf of the slaves and woman's rights. At the age of 25 she began her career as a minister, receiving official recognition from her church. Soon afterward the Unitarian doctrines of Elias Hicks created dissension among the Quakers, and she ardently espoused the Hicks movement. In 1833 a convention was held in Philadelphia to organize a National Anti-Slavery Society, and her aggressive speeches had an effect no less stimulating than the impression made by the appearance of a woman on the platform at such an assemblage was sensational. The toleration shown to Mrs. Mott on this occasion was certainly uncommon. Seven years later eight women were among the delegates sent to the World's Anti-Slavery Convention in London, but they were excluded from the floor.

For half a century Lucretia Mott was a pronounced total abstainer. She was quick to realize the full significance of the evils of the social drinking customs, and her influence, example and pen were devoted to the cause of reform. As a propagandist of radical and unpopular ideas she suffered great persecution, ridicule and denunciation, but in her old age she was regarded with peculiar tenderness and veneration. She died at the age of 87. "Far beyond the common limit," said Samuel Longfellow, at the memorial meeting held in the Unitarian Church in Germantown, Pa., "the light of that countenance has been before us and that voice heard wherever an unpopular truth needed defense, wherever a popular evil needed to be testified against, wherever a wronged man or woman needed a champion. There she stood, there she spoke the word that the spirit of truth and right bade her speak. How tranquil and serene her presence in the midst of multitudes that might become mobs. How calm yet how searching her judgment against wrong-doing. No whirlwind of passion or lightning of eloquence; it was rather the dawn of clear day upon dark places and hidden."

Narcotics, strictly speaking, are paralyzing poisons, whose effect when taken in certain moderate quantities is to induce languor, and in larger quantities lethargy, complete insensibility and death. The most prominent types are opium, morphia, Indian hemp, belladonna, atropia and henbane. Hops, to which the stupefying effects of beer are due, are also classed with the characteristic narcotics. There is much conflict of opinion among medical authorities as to the proper limitations of the term "narcotic." Some are even disinclined to apply it to such substances as ether, chloral, cocaine and chloroform, since these are volatile anæsthetics whose influence passes away after a comparatively brief period of time. Still more unwilling are other authorities to rank alcohol and tobacco with the narcotics; for there is a tendency to regard the immediate effects of these articles as essentially stimulating or exhilerating and therefore deserving of separate classification. But the growing recognition that the so-called stimulating properties of alcohol are deceptive and treacherous, and that its paralyzing and poisonous nature is really its distinctive quality, causes an increasingly persistent application to it of the definition "narcotic."

Indeed, in the popular acceptation of the term, the suggestion of a diseased craving and appetite is always implied when allusion is made to the narcotic effect. Any drug that excites morbid desire for repetitions of that drug and so gives development to the poison vice, is popularly regarded as a narcotic. The term, as applied to inebriants and enslaving poisons of all kinds, has the advantage of superior descriptiveness and comprehensiveness, and is not subject to the qualifications and restricted meanings that attach to such a word, for example, as "intoxicant," which refers peculiarly to alcohol and can hardly be extended to substances like opium, hasheesh and chloroform. The distinctions involved in the employment of words of comparatively narrow application, like "intoxication" and even "inebriety," call for a broader scientific name which will convey a general impression of all forms of alcoholism, intemperance, intoxication, opium-eating, tobacco-craving, etc.; and Dr. Norman Kerr has accordingly coined the new term "narcomania"—"in other words," says he, "a mania for narcotism of every kind, an inexpressibly intense involuntary morbid crave for the temporary anæsthetic relief promised by every form of narcotic."[1]

National Prohibition.—The traffic in alcoholic beverages is recognized as an existing and integral part of the general business of the country by the Constitution and laws of the United States; and, subject to such disabilities as may have been imposed upon it by statutes of the United States and Territorial enactments and by the legislation of the States within their several jurisdictions (which are limited both in legal scope and geographical boundaries), this trade has all the presumptions in its favor which belong to traffic in the necessaries of life. Like other occupations and their productions it is the subject of local law in the States so far as the National Government is not directly or indirectly supreme under the powers vested in the National Constitution. By Section 8 of the first Article of the Constitution Congress has power to regulate (not to destroy) commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes; therefore the property rights growing out of this occupation are under the protection of the general Goverment, both at home and abroad, and there is no legal presumption whatever against it any more than there would have been against the slave trade had there been no reference made to it in the Constitution. The Constitution applies to trades, occupations and rights of all kinds as it finds them, and protects whatsoever by express provision or necessary implication it does not destroy. In other words, there being nothing in the Constitution referring to the traffic in alcoholic beverages, either domestic or foreign, all legal presumptions are in its favor, just as they are in favor of any other existing and regular business, and the national powers, legislative, judicial and executive, are and will be in its favor until their action is reversed or modified by laws which may be properly enacted under the Constitution as it is or shall become by changes made by the people in the Constitution itself and by statutes thereafter enacted by Congress in accordance with such Amendments of the fundamental law. Property subject to taxation is entitled to protection and cannot be destroyed unless it be done by express authority of law and by due process of law.

The Constitution itself already provides methods for its peaceful amendment. Were this not so a written Constitution would be intolerable. Every important change which might become necessary would imply revolution and oftentimes war. The methods of its amendment are prescribed as follows in the 5th Article :

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or on application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which in either case shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress."

So far all Amendments, 15 in number, have been proposed by Congress and ratified by the Legislatures of the several States pursuant to the above-quoted provisions.

The object of National Prohibition is to secure the absolute Prohibition by the National Constitution and the necessary legislation in pursuance thereof of the manufacture, sale, importation, exportation and transportation of alcohol, in all its forms, preparations and adulterations, for use by human beings as a drink; and a perfect measure should include all possible methods of consumption by the human organism, whether as a beverage or otherwise, except as a medicine or under those conditions when the administration of a poison is justified. The individual should not be at liberty to poison himself according to law. Some believe that National Prohibition should include every poison as well as alcohol, and the personal use as well as the traffic. This is but the application of the common law in the prohibition of suicide and voluntary self-inflicted injuries to life and health. Sumptuary laws do not relate to the use of poisons, and the hurtful personal use as well as the traffic in any poison should be prohibited by an efficient law of the land. The efforts of the friends of National Constitutional Prohibition, however, have not so far been carried to that extent. It is doubted by many whether the national power should be exerted beyond the manufacture and traffic in the poisonous article. In practical measures we must consider not only what is right but what is in our time possible.

---

[1] Inebriety, p. 34.

Up to the present time three joint resolutions proposing Federal Prohibitory Amendments have been introduced in Congress. The first was offered by the writer of this article, as a member of the House of Representatives of the 44th Congress, Dec. 12, 1876. The proposed Amendment was in the following words:

"ARTICLE —.

"SEC. 1.—From and after the year of our Lord 1900 the manufacture and sale of distilled alcoholic intoxicating liquors, or alcoholic liquors any part of which is obtained by distillation or process equivalent thereto, or any intoxicating liquors mixed or adulterated with ardent spirits or with any poison whatever, except for medicinal, mechanical, chemical and scientific purposes, and for use in the arts, anywhere within the United States and the Territories thereof, shall cease; and the importation of such liquors from foreign states and countries to the United States and Territories, and the exportation of such liquors from and the transportation thereof within and through any part of this country, except for the use and purposes aforesaid, shall be, and hereby is, forever thereafter prohibited.

"SEC. 2.—Nothing in this Article shall be construed to waive or abridge any existing power of Congress, nor the right, which is hereby recognized, of the people of any State or Territory to enact laws to prevent the increase and for the suppression or regulation of the manufacture, sale and use of liquors and the ingredients thereof, any part of which is alcoholic, intoxicating or poisonous, within its own limits, and for the exclusion of such liquors and ingredients therefrom at any time, as well before as after the close of the year of our Lord 1900; but until then, and until 10 years after the ratification hereof as provided in the next section, no State or Territory shall interfere with the transportation of said liquor or ingredients, in packages safely secured, over the usual lines of traffic, to other States and Territories wherein the manufacture, sale and use thereof for other purposes and use than those excepted in the 1st Section shall be lawful; *provided* that the true destination of such packages be plainly marked thereon.

"SEC. 3.—Should this Article not be ratified by three-fourths of the States on or before the last day of December, 1890, then the 1st Section hereof shall take effect and be in force at the expiration of 10 years from such ratification; and the assent of any State to this Article shall not be rescinded nor reversed.

"SEC. 4.—Congress shall enforce this Article by all needful legislation."

The second proposition was submitted in the Senate during the 46th Congress by the Hon. Preston B. Plumb of Kansas. It was prepared by Mr. A. M. Powell for the National Temperance Society, and was essentially the Kansas State Constitutional Amendment applied to the whole country. It provided for Prohibition of both distilled and fermented liquors.

The third joint resolution was introduced by the writer in the Senate of the 50th Congress, Dec. 12, 1887, and the text of it was agreed upon "in personal conference between Mr. Powell, Mr. John N. Stearns and Mr. Blair upon two occasions, and by correspondence with Miss Frances E. Willard, John B. Finch and other leading Prohibitionists." It was a compromise of differences of opinion as to the form of the proposed Amendment, in order that there might be united effort to secure the substance of what was desired by all. It was as follows:

"ARTICLE —.

"SEC. 1.—The manufacture, importation, exportation, transportation and sale of all alcoholic liquors as a beverage shall be, and hereby is, forever prohibited in the United States and in every place subject to their jurisdiction.

"SEC. 2.—Congress shall enforce this Article by all needful legislation."

Reports prepared by the writer favoring the submission of the Amendment to the States were made by the Senate Committee (upon the first of the three joint resolutions) in the 49th Congress, and by the Senate Committee (upon the third proposition) in the 50th Congress. But neither the Senate nor the House, as a body, has yet given the requisite vote. The Amendment in its present form (as last quoted above) seems to be satisfactory to all the supporters of the movement and will probably be pressed by the temperance sentiment of the country until it becomes a part of our fundamental legislation.

It is not possible to enter upon even a summary statement of the arguments in favor of National Prohibition in this article, but these considerations may be noted:

1.—That the traffic in alcohol is a unit and diffused like poison in the atmosphere throughout the whole nation. It is as impossible for States alone to control it even within their own borders as it would be for them to deal effectually with a permanent pestilence already established in all parts of the country. There must be a national quarantine, and both national and State effort throughout our whole geographical extent. There should also be international combination to suppress the traffic. The business should everywhere be outlawed. It does more harm than the slave trade ever did and there should be no delay on the part of any single nation to demand of all others the suppression of this pernicious traffic in human bodies and souls.

2.—It is manifestly impossible for one or for several States fully to prohibit, prevent or punish as a crime that which is sanctioned and protected as a legitimate business by the remaining States, in the Territories and District of Columbia, and by the overshadowing power of the general Government everywhere. This national recognition of the traffic is the destruction of the rights of the States in their efforts to secure Prohibition within their own borders. If Prohibition in the States does not prohibit it is because the national power everywhere prevents, and in effect prohibits Prohibition. The Constitution of the United States is practically a supreme law of the land in favor of free rum. A poison gas which escapes anywhere is confined nowhere. Besides, it should be remembered that the dignity and power pertaining to the national administration of the law render the nation a much more formidable antagonist to this tremendous alcoholic power than are the people, officers and tribunals of the States.

3.—National Prohibition is necessary in order to protect and preserve the very existence of the police power of the States. The police power, which belongs to the States, is for the preservation of order and the protection of the life, health and safety of the people; but the protection of the liquor trade by the nation and by the surrounding States renders null and void the efforts of those States which would exercise their admitted right within their own borders to suppress the traffic in order that they may preserve the life, health and property of their citizens. This shows the unsoundness of the pretended objection to such an Amendment that it would be an interference with or violation of the police rights of the States. It would only be a guaranty of their existence and complete exercise against the worst enemy which assails public order, life, liberty, health and property in any State. It might as well be said that the existing national guaranty of a republican form of government to the States is a violation of their right to governments republican in form.

4.—Should it be conceded that Congress may so regulate commerce that there shall be no infringement by national statutes upon the local police power in a State, still so long as any State is permitted to manufacture and sell it will be practically impossible to suppress the traffic even in the States which enact the most stringent Prohibitory laws. Besides, should Congress by statute prohibit the importation from other countries and also the importation from one State to another in which the traffic were prohibited such national legislation, like that in the States, would be fluctuating and transitory and could be permanently secured only by constitutional law.

5.—Even if the National Constitution were a blank upon the subject and every State were like an independent nation, with absolute legal power over the liquor traffic within its own borders, still there should be a National Constitutional Amendment for its prohibition because no State, any more than an individual, should be permitted to so use its real or personal property or its powers of any kind as to injure other States and their people. No State should be allowed to create and trade in a universal calamity. Unless there be assistance afforded rather than opposition made by the National Constitution and laws to the States in the exercise of the local police power for the protection of their people, those States which enact Prohibitory laws will be justified in resorting to the war power which is inherent as the essence of the police power and in a State is the right of self-defense—whenever, after exhausting all peaceable efforts, it shall plainly be necessary in order to protect the lives, health and property of the people. Therefore in order to preserve the national peace in the last resort there should be National Prohibition.

6.—No one nation can wholly extinguish even within its own borders this great crime against civilization. Prohibition by the world is necessary. But in order to secure this greatest end there must be action by individual nations. Let the United States be the first. As England abolished the slave trade, so let America abolish the still worse trade in poison-drink, first within her own borders and then by a dignified but determined demand of the nations of the earth that the international traffic in alcoholic beverages shall cease.

The subject is more fully discussed in "The Temperance Movement, or, The Conflict of Man with Alcohol," and in the speeches and reports made by the writer in the House and Senate of the United States.

HENRY W. BLAIR.

National Temperance League (England).—Organized in 1856 through a consolidation of the National Temperance Society and the London Temperance League. Its avowed object is "The promotion of temperance by the practice and advocacy of total abstinence from intoxicating beverages." A person of either sex is eligible to membership who signs the total abstinence pledge and pays 2*s* 6*d* per annum. "The League's agencies are comprehensive and unsectarian. It assists local societies and individual workers, and seeks to accomplish its great object by means of public meetings, lectures, sermons, tract distribution, domiciliary visitation; conferences with the clergy, medical practitioners, schoolmasters, magistrates and other persons of influence; deputations to teachers and students in universities, colleges, training institutions and schools; missionary efforts among sailors, soldiers, the militia, the police and other classes." Besides securing many thousand pledges at the military and naval stations, the League has issued valuable temperance school-books that have been widely circulated. Its influence on the medical profession is worthy of special notice. In 1871 it secured the signatures of 269 eminent physicians to an important and aggressive declaration touching the true nature of alcohol. Another result was the arrangement of a course of lectures by Dr. B. W. Richardson to the medical students of metropolitan hospitals in 1887, and the organization of the British Medical Temperance Association, numbering (in 1889) 387 medical abstainers, with 115 associated students. The newspapers published are the *Temperance Record* and the *Medical Temperance Journal.* The headquarters are at 33 Paternoster Row, London, E. C. Chief officers (1889): President, Right Rev. Frederick Temple, D.D., Lord Bishop of London; Secretary, Mr. Robert Rae.

National Temperance Society and Publication House.—The most important general temperance organization in the United States. It was founded in 1865, "for the special work of creating and circulating a sound temperance literature, to promote the cause of total abstinence from the use, manufacture and sale of all alcoholic beverages, and to unify and concentrate the temperance sentiment of the nation against the drink and the drink traffic." It has uniformly and uncompromisingly advocated total abstinence for the individual and Prohibition for the State; but it has no connection with partisan politics and is strictly non-sectarian in religion, and among its Vice-Presidents (including representative leaders in all the States and Territories) are persons attached to all political organizations and creeds. The life-membership fee is $20; and anyone in agreement with the purposes of the Society may become a Life-Director and have a life-voice and vote in all the meetings by paying $100. Its income is derived from subscriptions, bequests and the sale of publications; for the year 1889–90 the receipts aggregated $48,843.23 and the expenditures $49,512.09. More than 1,850 different publications are included in its catalogue. Its chief periodical is the *National Temperance Advocate* (monthly), an able journal. The *Youth's Temperance Banner*, for children, has a monthly circulation of more than 100,000. The *Water Lily*, another periodical for children, has 40,000 subscribers.

The Society has been prominently and actively identified with nearly all the important work done for total abstinence and Prohibition in the United States in the last 25 years. It has given particular attention to the cultivation of temperance sentiment among the freedmen of the South, sending to them speakers, missionaries and great quantities of literature. The fundamental interests of the temperance cause have also been promoted by holding conventions, conferences and mass-meetings, introducing temperance text-books into the schools and scattering literature in jails, hospitals, etc. It has taken especial interest in the Prohibitory Amendment campaigns in the various States, providing literature in abundance and furnishing speakers. The Society has drafted and urged the passage of several of the representative measures introduced in Congress—notably the proposed Federal Prohibitory Amendment and the bill to create a Federal Commission to investigate the drink traffic. "In the political arena," says the twenty-fifth annual report, "the agitation has become intense, as never before during the history of our Society, and awakened largely by our energies."

The first President of the Society was William E. Dodge. Mr. Dodge died in 1883, and was succeeded by Mark Hopkins, D.D. In 1885 Theodore L. Cuyler, D.D., was chosen President, and he is still at the head. The Secretary is J. N. Stearns; Treasurer, W. D. Porter.

Nazarites were those persons in ancient Israel who were either separated to God by consecration from birth, as in the cases of Samson (Judg. 13:7), Samuel (I Sam. 1: 11, 22, 28) and John the Baptist (Luke 1: 15), or by vow for a definite period, as provided in Numbers 6: 3–6, where the law of the Nazarite is given as follows: "When either man or woman shall separate themselves to vow a vow of a Nazarite, to separate themselves unto the Lord, he shall separate himself from wine and strong drink, and shall drink no vinegar of wine, or vinegar of strong drink, neither shall he drink any liquor of grapes, nor eat moist grapes, or dried. All the days of his separation shall he eat nothing that is made of the vine-tree, from the kernels even to the husk. All the days of the vow of his separation there shall no razor come upon his head; until the days be fulfilled, in the which he separateth himself unto the Lord, he shall be holy, and shall let the locks of the hair of his head grow. All the days that he separateth himself unto the Lord he shall come at no dead body." In the case of a Nazarite separated for life the prohibition of all intoxicants extended to the mother during the period of pregnancy as well as to the child after birth. Thus in Judg. 13: 7, the command to the mother of Samson was: "Behold, thou shalt conceive, and bear a son; and now drink no wine nor strong drink, neither eat any unclean thing, for the child shall be a Nazarite to God from the womb to the day of his death;" while the precaution was taken of repeating these instructions to Manoah, the woman's husband (verses 13 and 14): "Of all that I said unto the woman let her beware. She may not eat of anything that cometh of the vine, neither let her drink wine or strong drink, nor eat any unclean thing; all that I commanded her let her observe." So also Hannah, the mother of Samuel, after her prayer in the temple that a child might be given her whom she should consecrate to the Lord, being charged with drunkenness by Eli the priest, replied (I Sam. 1: 5): "No, my lord, I am a woman of a sorrowful spirit: I have drunk neither wine nor strong drink, but have poured out my soul before the Lord." The importance of total abstinence in the service of a Nazarite is clearly shown in God's reproach to Israel, through the prophet Amos (2:10–12): "I brought you up from the land of Egypt, and led you 40 years through the wilderness, to possess the land of the Amorites. And I raised up of your sons for prophets, and of your young men for Nazarites. Is it not even thus, O ye children of Israel? saith the Lord. But ye gave the Nazarites wine to drink; and commanded the prophets, saying, Prophesy not." Jeremiah (Lam. 4:7) describes Israel's Nazarites as they were in the sight of God before the time of her idolatrous abominations: "Her Nazarites were purer than snow, they were whiter than milk, they were more ruddy in body than rubies, their polishing was of sapphire."

The word "Nazarite" should not be confounded with "Nazarene." The latter had no special significance in the early history of the Jews, and in Christ's time and for many years after was used simply as a name for a person born in Nazareth.

Nebraska Campaign.—Since the article on CONSTITUTIONAL PROHIBITION was finished the Prohibitory Amendment campaign in the State of Nebraska has been fought, resulting in the defeat of the measure by a considerable majority. This contest overshadowed in importance all that had preceded it: even in the Massachusetts and Pennsylvania campaigns of 1889 there was not so much at stake. Nebraska was the first State to adopt the $1,000 license system, and a repudiation of that policy by popular vote after a nine years' trial would have gone far toward putting an end to the High License compromise. Success there would have established State Prohibition throughout a wide strip of territory from the Canadian border to Texas. This would have been of immense advantage to the movement for permanent and comprehensive rather than experimental and local Prohibition, and for rigid enforcement over a great area of the country; since the anti-liquor interests of the five States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska and Kansas, and the Indian and Oklahoma Territories, would have become identical, and the possibility of repeal would have been practically removed in each of them by the moral and political effect of so significant a victory. This was also the most instructive of Prohibition campaigns, showing, more convincingly than had ever been done, the artfulness and cowardice of the liquor traffic, the deceptions and unscrupulousness of its defenders and their absolute inability to contend with the Prohibitionists by legitimate methods; the corruption of the press, the servility of politicians and the comparative feebleness of a righteous cause when resisted determinedly by well-organized combinations of desperate, selfish and shrewd men.

The circumstances leading to the enactment of Nebraska's liquor law, and much evidence of its entire failure as a temperance measure, are presented in HIGH LICENSE. Dissatisfaction with the act began to develop after two or three years, and increased steadily. The demand for submission of a Prohibitory Amendment, first urged in 1881, was renewed in 1883, and was made a leading feature of political agitation in each subsequent year. The defeat of the submission resolution in the Republican Legislature of 1883 led to the organization of the Prohibition party in 1884 and the polling of 2,899 votes for St. John. In 1885 the Prohibition vote rose to 4,445. By 1886 the movement had become so strong that the rural element compelled the Republican State Convention, despite the opposition of the most prominent party leaders, to pledge submission. This action did not check the Prohibition party, which increased its vote to 8,175. In the Legislature of 1887 the pledge was repudiated and submission was again voted down. The question was excitedly debated in the Republican Convention of 1887, and the anti-Prohibition managers of that body persuaded the temperance people to omit the pledge from the platform and refer the subject for final decision to the Republican primaries of 1888. The Prohibition party once more showed respectable strength, polling 7,359 votes at the State election of 1887. In 1888 great efforts were made by the liquor element of the Republican party to secure a majority of the delegates to the State Convention, and the pro-liquor leaders carefully organized the Committee on Resolutions so as to defeat the Submissionists. This Committee accordingly brought in a report in which submission was ignored. But the sentiment for Prohibition prevailed against all the arts of the "bosses;" an appeal was taken to the Convention, and after an all-night debate the pledge of 1886 was re-adopted by a vote of 310 to 290. At the Presidential election the Prohibition party had a larger following than ever before, and cast 9,429 votes for Fisk. The Legislature of 1889 was so cunningly manipulated by the saloon politicians that submission barely escaped a fifth defeat; although the Republicans had 76 votes in the House in a total of 100, and 27 of the 33 Senators, the Submission resolution carried in the House by a majority of only one vote (given by a Democrat), and even then the Submissionists were compelled to agree to an alternative Amendment providing for license.

It cannot be doubted that the popular feeling in Nebraska was overwhelmingly in favor of Prohibition up to the time of submission in 1889. The growth of the Prohibition party and the uncompromising utterances of the religious denominations (see pp. 214–15) were most significant. The bitterness with which the liquor men and their political supporters fought the demand for a vote on the question was a tacit acknowledgement that submission and Prohibition were equivalent terms. And when the character of this opposition is considered, it is hard to resist the conclusion that the submission majorities in the Republican Conventions of 1886 and 1888 were given on the merits of the Prohibition question itself as understood by a majority of the people. The Republican party had for years been dominated by a number of very able and aggressive anti-Prohibitionists, like John M. Thurston, Governor Thayer and Edward Rosewater (editor of the Omaha *Bee*); Peter E. Iler, the noted Omaha distiller, was also one of the recognized Republican leaders. These men, with others equally hostile to Prohibition, were accustomed to shape the party's policy. From the first they fought submission not so much because they denied the right of the people to vote on the subject as because they recognized that Prohibition would probably carry if a vote were taken. Throughout Nebraska it was understood that this reason animated the anti-Submissionists; and certainly no one really opposed to Prohibition could have afforded to ignore the opinions of these experienced politicians or to regard the submission plan with approval or indifference. To stifle the submission sentiment very disreputable work was done. It was testified by Mr. Iler, in a legislative bribery investigation in 1889, that in order to prejudice the minds of Nebraska voters he induced the proprietor of the Omaha *Bee* to print a number of letters from Iowa discrediting the effects of Prohibition (these letters having been prepared with the greatest unfairness), and sent many copies of the *Bee* containing them to the constituents of legislators, expending $4,000 for this purpose; that in the legislative campaigns of 1888 he spent from $4,000 to $5,500 to elect men pledged against submission, and that at the legislative session of 1889, when the Submission bill was up for final passage, he secretly went to Lincoln (the State capital) and gave to a professional lobbyist the sum of $3,500, to be used (without limitations or conditions) for strengthening the anti-submission following in the Legislature.

The proposed Prohibitory Amendment was as follows:[1]

> "The manufacture, sale and keeping for sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage are forever prohibited in this State, and the Legislature shall provide by law for the enforcement of this provision."

Concurrently with this there was submitted another Amendment providing that

> "The manufacture, sale and keeping for sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage shall be licensed and regulated by law."

The two Amendments were to be voted on separately, the 4th day of November, 1890. For the adoption of either proposition it was necessary to poll a majority of all the votes cast for State officers the same day.

Preparations for the campaign began soon after the fall elections of 1889. To insure harmony a union of the Prohibition party, Good Templars and Woman's Christian Temperance Union was effected. Early in 1890 an Inter-State League of friends of Prohibition in Iowa, Kansas, the Dakotas and Nebraska was formed to assist the Nebraska agitation. The chief work of the campaign was done by the Prohibition party, under the direction of A. G. Wolfenbarger, A. Roberts, H. C. Bittenbender and others, with the co-operation of the W. C. T. U. and Good Templars. The Inter-State League held important meetings, addressed by eminent public men from Kansas and Iowa, and the testimony that they bore to the success of Prohibition in practice was very helpful to the cause. The League also circulated considerable literature. A non-partisan State organization performed some good service, but the results of its labors were disappointing to those who looked to it to take the lead. The New York *Voice*, by appeals to the temperance people of the country, raised about $34,000 for the campaign, of which a part was used for sending that newspaper to a selected list of names and the remainder was paid over to the Nebraska organizations. The State was thoroughly canvassed by the best Prohibition speakers and earnest support was given by the clergy and other classes of conscientious and intelligent citizens.

From the beginning there were significant indications of the determination of the liquor leaders to hazard any amount of money and resort to any practices necessary for winning the election in Nebraska. The national organs of the traffic, as early as January, 1890, showed full appreciation of the importance of the contest, the *Brewers' Journal* declaring that it was to be "a fight for life and death of Prohibition." The United States Brewers' Association, at its annual Convention in 1890, amended its constitution so as to double the rates of assessment upon members and thus produce a doubled income (see foot-note, p. 381); and there can hardly be a doubt that this action was taken with a view to making a great contribution to the anti-Prohibition fund in Nebraska, since there was no other important emergency then before the "trade."

---

[1] See the "Nebraska House Journal for 1889," pp. 1,389-70; also the *Voice*, March 13, 1890.

In the winter months of 1890 a letter was sent from Lincoln, Neb., to representative distillers, brewers and liquor-sellers in various States, defining the issues at stake and asking for opinions and suggestions. The writer was a Prohibitionist, and his object was to test the views of the "trade" at large as to the situation and as to the methods that ought to be used by the foes of Prohibition. Many answers were received, all exhibiting lively interest; and the plainest intimations were given that it would be unwise to make the contest in a straightforward way, to engage in a discussion of the question on its merits or to permit the rumsellers to take any prominent part publicly in the agitation, that strenuous appeals should be made to the selfishness of voters by dwelling upon the revenue aspects of High License, that no pains should be spared to bribe the newspapers of the State and the politicians of both the leading parties, and that, in general, the hopes of the traffic depended entirely upon suppressing fair argument and employing large sums of money shrewdly and unscrupulously. The success attending such tactics in former Amendment struggles was frankly described and much secret information was imparted. (Quotations from the letters are made in various articles in this work. See especially pp. 119, 125–6 and 219–20. For the letters in detail see the *Voice* for April 3 and 17, and May 8, 1890. The Crowell-Cheves revelations [see pp. 120–2] were among the results of this correspondence.)

Another interesting exposure was made in April. Nebraska is an agricultural State, and it was necessary for the liquor advocates to propagandize among the farmers. Before the campaign had fairly opened thousands of Nebraska farmers received in their mails copies of a pretended agricultural newspaper, the *Farm Herald.* This journal was filled with anti-Prohibition pleas. To the ordinary reader, however, it appeared to be issued by disinterested men, for there was nothing to show that it emanated from liquor sources; the name of "The American Printing Company, Louisville, Ky.," was given as that of the responsible publisher. Investigation proved that this company had no separate identity, but was a mere disguise for the great whiskey organization known as the National Protective Association, while the *Farm Herald* had no list of *bona fide* subscribers and was edited in a whiskey establishment in Louisville. (See the *Voice*, April 17, 1890.)

The ardor and intolerance with which the drunkard-makers' cause was championed by the leading newspapers of Nebraska excited suspicions; and to ascertain the motives of their attitude a letter was mailed from Louisville in May to Nebraska editors, asking them to name the rates for which they would print in their editorial and news columns such anti-Prohibition matter as should be furnished them by the negotiator. Accompanying the letter was a printed slip containing glaringly unfair and dishonest anti-Prohibition statistics: this was submitted as a specimen of the articles that would be provided. About 60 newspaper proprietors responded,[1] eagerly offering to sell their columns to the liquor men, without regard to the character of the "matter." Among the journals represented were the most influential dailies of the State, including the Lincoln *State Journal* and the Omaha *Bee* and *Republican*. (See the *Voice*, May 29, June 5 and 12, 1890.) The liquor leaders took advantage of the greed of the press. Several prominent journals that favored Prohibition at the start found it impossible to resist the tempting bribes that came to them from saloon headquarters. Most of the representative newspapers ranked with the dramshops themselves as partisan promoters of the cause of rum; no quarter or courtesy was shown to the Prohibitionists; the most impressive evidence ever presented touching the practical benefits of a scheme of public policy was ignored, and false and distorted figures, reports and claims were deliberately paraded. Against this newspaper opposition the advocates of the Amendment were all but powerless. The printed exposures, while circulated extensively by such papers as the *Voice*, the Chicago *Lever*, the Lincoln *New Republic* and the Lincoln *Daily Call* (the only important daily that favored Prohibition), either did not reach the masses of the people or were regarded by the average reader as less authoritative than the declarations of organs whose statements and opinions had always been respected.

---

[1] This revelation gave rise to one of the popular songs of the campaign:

"Dear Sir: I'll print your whiskey views for 40 cents a line;
I'll print them, too, dear sir, as news, for 40 cents a line.
I'll sell out home, and country, too, for 40 cents a line,—
Yes, everything for revenue,—just 40 cents a line.

"For editorial I must have 50 cents a line;
This business may my paper bust, this 40 cents a line.
The *Journal* I will sell to you at 40 cents a line,—
To fight the rummies' battle thro', for 40 cents a line.

. . . .

"And hearts may bleed, and mothers sigh, yet 40 cents a line
Will close my ear to every cry, just 40 cents a line.
All hail the man who can't be bought, for 40 cents a line—
Whom Turner letters never caught, for 40 cents a line!"

In the conduct of the campaign the example set by the Eastern liquor organizations was carefully copied. The liquor-dealers, as such, did not engage openly in the fight. They effected preparations, however, early in the spring, and committed the work to a so-called "Business Men's and Bankers' Association." This name was chosen to mislead the public and to secure the co-operation of respectable citizens. It was afterward shown that 63 per cent. of the Nebraska bankers were for the Amendment (see the *Voice*, Oct. 3, 1890), while more than 2,700 business men (including many in Omaha and other important centers) signed either the following statement or a similar one:

"*Whereas*, The defenders and apologists of the licensed liquor traffic in Nebraska and the nation have organized a so-called 'Business Men's and Bankers' Association' to serve the interests of the brewers, distillers and saloon-keepers in a desperate effort to defeat Constitutional Prohibition in this State; and

"*Whereas*, The various branches of legitimate business are associated in the declarations of this society with the opposition to Constitutional Prohibition, therefore

"We, the undersigned business men and bankers of the State of Nebraska, do hereby protest against the unwarranted assertion of the friends of the licensed liquor traffic that 'Prohibition is inimical to the material welfare of the State,' and assert as our deliberate judgment and belief:

"1. That Constitutional Prohibition, in outlawing and abolishing the saloon, will greatly stimulate and benefit all lines of legitimate business.

"2. That the vast amount of money, amounting to many millions of dollars annually, now being squandered for drink in the saloons of Nebraska, will by the adoption of the pending Prohibitory Amendment be turned into the proper channels of trade, resulting in untold benefits to the business man and banker, as well as to the toiling thousands on whom the financial prosperity of this country depends.

"We therefore advise all who would conserve the material, educational and moral welfare of Nebraska, and who would invite to our State the most desirable classes of immigrants, to work and vote for Constitutional Prohibition Nov. 4, 1890."[1]

The arrogance with which it was claimed that the material interests of Nebraska would be promoted and her moral and religious interests would not be injured by the rejection of the Amendment induced the Prohibitionists to seek opinions from highly representative leaders of special classes, like the workingmen, farmers, clergy and teachers. The following appeal to wage-workers was issued, signed by 42 of the foremost leaders of organized labor:[2]

"*To the Workingmen of Nebraska:*

"We believe that the saloon system is no help to organized labor in its endeavors to secure the just demands of the workingmen; that the abolition of the corrupting influences of the saloon in politics would help in the endeavor to elect honest men to office who will act as the representatives of the whole people and not as the tools of individuals or a particular class.

"We believe that the prosperity of a people does not depend upon retaining an institution which tends to corrupt and weaken its individual members, and that the power of organized labor would be greater to-day were it not for the debauching influence of saloons.

---

[1] See the *Voice*, Oct. 2, 1890.

[2] Among others, by the Grand Chief Conductor of the Brotherhood of Railway Conductors, the General Secretary of the Hatmakers' National Association, the President, Secretary and Treasurer of the United Mine-Workers of America, the General Secretary of the Boot and Shoemakers' International Union, the President of the Tackmakers' Protective Union, the President of the Journeymen Barbers' Independent National Union of America, the General Secretary of the Amalgamated Carpenters' National Union, the General Secretary of the United Brotherhood of Printers and Decorators of America, the General Secretary of the Horse Collarmakers' National Union, a General Organizer of the American Federation of Labor and 30 influential Knights of Labor. (See the *Voice*, Oct. 23, 1890.)

"Workingmen of Nebraska need not hesitate to vote for the abolition of the saloon through fear of the infringement of 'personal liberty.' On the contrary, there is reason to believe that with the saloon system abolished and the workingmen sober, united and steadfast, our liberties will become more secure and our advancement toward justice more certain."

This address to the farmers received the signatures of 31 leaders of agricultural organizations:[1]

"*To the Farmers of Nebraska:*

"We believe that Prohibition of the liquor traffic would benefit the farmer by removing one of the principal causes of crime and thus tending to reduce his taxes; by increasing the demand for food and clothing (the raw materials for which are produced by the farmer) among a large class who now spend their money in the saloons, and by destroying one of the main sources of corruption in politics—the purchasable saloon vote.

"A sober people can be more readily brought to consider and right the wrongs of the farmers and other unjustly treated classes than a people a considerable portion of which, owing to the debasing influence of the saloon, can be controlled for private purposes on election day.

"We have no faith in the reports which have been circulated that Prohibition is the cause of the depressed condition of agriculture in States that have outlawed the saloon. The causes of depressed agriculture are other and exist in license as well as Prohibition States.

"We believe that the farmers of Nebraska can vote for the pending Prohibitory Amendment without fear of injury to their interests, but rather in the belief that good will result to them through this proposed outlawing of the liquor traffic."

Distinguished leaders of religious denominations showed their interest by issuing the following (to which 55 names were signed):[2]

"*To the Christian Voters of Nebraska:*

"We, the undersigned, Christian ministers and officers of various denominations, unite in urging the Christian citizens of Nebraska to exert their influence against the further legalization of the saloons, and to vote for the Prohibitory Amendment. We believe that the moral and religious interests not only of Nebraska but of the entire country are involved in the issue of the present campaign in Nebraska. The triumph of the saloons must ever be a calamity to the church as well as to the State. Intemperance is something more than a political evil; it is a sin against God, and the licensed saloon is a legalized and organized temptation to commit that sin. As the New York *Tribune* said several years ago:

"'There is to-day in the English-speaking countries no such tremendous, far-reaching, vital question as that of drunkenness. In its implications and effects it overshadows all else. It is impossible to examine any subject connected with the progress, the civilization, the physical well-being, the religious condition of the masses, without encountering this monstrous evil. It lies at the center of all social and political mischief. It paralyzes all beneficent energies in every direction. It neutralizes educational agencies. It silences the voice of religion.'

"There is, therefore, an irrepressible conflict between the church and the liquor traffic. License, high or low, provides for the continuance of the traffic and offers no adequate barriers against its evils. The duty of the Christian seems to us to be clear. It is to assist in every legitimate way to put an end to a legalized traffic which can prosper only by debauching men, wreaking untold misery upon the homes of the community."

Twenty-four County Superintendents of Public Instruction in Nebraska joined in this appeal:

"*To the Friends of Education in Nebraska:*

"We believe in the long run that the cause of public education would be greatly benefited by the abolition of the saloon system. Under Prohibition enforced a large per cent. of our school children would be better fed, better clothed, better trained at home, better supplied with books and consequently better fitted to receive and profit by the instruction given in the schools.

"Prohibition would tend to increase the attendance at the schools. Teachers would be more respected, because they would be able to attain better results with pupils freed from the curse of ruined homes and drunken parents.

"We have no sympathy with the cry that the license money paid by the saloon is necessary to sustain an efficient public school system. On the contrary we believe that were the saloon system utterly abolished it would result in a greatly increased interest in the support and development of our schools.

"The friends of our public school system need not hesitate to vote for Prohibition at the coming election through any fear of injuring the cause of education."

It became evident in the closing month of the canvass that the liquor managers were engaged in systematically purchasing the services of the political workers. The chief party leaders, with few exceptions, were already on their side. And now it was discovered that throughout the State politicians of local influence were to be bribed to work against the Amendment at the polls. This was revealed in statements made in confidential letters from Dr. George L. Miller, of the Executive Committee of the Business Men's and Bankers' Association, to an Albany, (N. Y.) correspondent. Dr. Miller wrote, in part:

---

[1] Including the Secretary of the American Shorthorn Breeders' Association, the ex-Secretary of the Northwestern Dairymens' Association, the Secretary of the American Horticultural Society, the Secretary of the American Galloway Breeders' National Association, the Secretary of the Ayreshire Breeders' National Association, the Superintendent of Advanced Registry of the Holstein-Friesian Association of America, the Presidents or Secretaries of State Grangers or Farmers' Alliances for the States of Nebraska, Alabama, Tennessee, Louisiana, Texas, North Dakota, Michigan, Illinois, New Jersey, Colorado. Kentucky, North Carolina, and the Indian and New Mexico Territories, as well as editors of prominent agricultural journals. (See the *Voice*, Oct. 23, 1890.)

[2] Including ten Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, two Bishops of the United Brethren Church, three Presidents of colleges, and Secretaries, Vice-Presidents, etc., of very prominent societies and boards. (See the *Voice*, Oct. 30, 1890.)

"We can understand the importance to you[1] of success here in the contest before us which is now on and in full activity, but on our part not noisy activity. . . . Our policy has been to reserve our closing-in fire until the later days of the contest, and for this we shall need every dollar we can lay our hands on. This is equivalent to saying that we shall be glad to receive from you the amount you suggest, and we need not say how much we appreciate your thought of us. . . . Our Treasurer, Mr. Coe, recently returned from a visit to Peoria to meet the magnates of the Whiskey Trust, with a view to obtaining instant aid. . . . A Mr. Turner, of the Louisville bureau, and Mr. P. E. Iler, of this town, had led us to rely upon large help from that quarter. . . . As to the brewers, within the last past 10 days the Omaha brewers have secured a conditional subscription of $25,000 from the brewers in Omaha and outside of the State. I understand the condition of the subscription to have been that the Whiskey Trust shall subscribe an equal amount. . . .

"I regret that my letter was defective in not being sufficiently explicit as to our plan of campaign. I assume that when you were assured that the conditions upon which your proposed contributions would be made would be carefully observed, you could trust us to do the best that could be done in placing the money where it would do the most good in getting the greatest number of anti-Amendment votes into the ballot-boxes. I make amends by stating that our plans are well matured to do with our money precisely what I understand you would do with it were you and your Association on the ground in person, with the exception, viz.: Our plan employs two managing politicians in each Congressional District (we have three districts, and our voting territory covers 70,000 square miles), whose duty it is to direct the local contests on non-partisan lines; these men, carefully chosen, aid the Executive Committee in choosing men in the 1,800 voting precincts of the State whose duty it will be to work at the polls to the last hour on election day for our cause—one man from the Republican party and one from the Democratic party. This is the plan. As you may justly infer, our plan is a wise one. Our whole trouble is to get enough money to carry it out. . . .

"As you will see by the printed statement I send you we are reserving every dollar for the closing days of the contest, fully appreciating all you say on this head. We are not novices in politics in Nebraska. . . .

"Two *or more* non-partisan workers are to be employed at the voting places.

"Mr. P.E. Iler, our chief distiller, telegraphs Mr. Davis of our 1st National Bank to-day that the Peoria gentlemen (the Whiskey Trust) have made an appropriation to our cause, but we know nothing about the amount. . . .

"Good judgments here concur in the belief *that by reserving our fire until the last we can beat the Amendment*. . . . Any who doubt our ability can send prudent men to see the things done, but in no event can we consent to anything like an open association with the liquor interests of the country."[2]

The naturally powerful rum element in the cities of Nebraska had been steadily and materially strengthened by the immigration of ex-saloon keepers and foreign-born citizens from Iowa and Kansas. Omaha had become the greatest liquor center between Kansas City and the Pacific coast. It was generally expected that the United States Census for 1890 (taken in June) would accredit to all the Nebraska cities large gains in population; but few were prepared for the startling figures announced by the Census Bureau. The population of Omaha, which had been only 30,518 in 1880, was now placed at 139,405;[3] and Lincoln, containing only 13,003 inhabitants in 1880, was given 55,273. Systematic canvasses of the two cities, made by the Prohibitionists in the fall, resulted in the discovery that the Census enumerators had added many thousands to the actual totals. It was charged that the officials had deliberately conspired with the saloon managers to so swell the returns that great frauds might be perpetrated with impunity at the Amendment election. (See the *Voice*, Oct. 16 and 23, 1890.) The Democratic party placed in its State platform a declaration against Prohibition, and the Democratic speakers antagonized the policy with great zeal. The Chairman of the Republican State Committee publicly used his influence to the same end. On the ballots distributed by the organizations of all the political parties except the Prohibition party the Prohibitory Amendment proposition was printed in the negative only; so that these ballots, if voted just as they were received by the citizens, were certain to count against Prohibition. At many polling-places on election day the Prohibitionists were assaulted, mobbed and persecuted; in Omaha there was riot and bloodshed in nearly every ward. (See the *Voice,* Nov. 6, 13 and 27, and Dec. 4 and 18, 1890.) No element of violent and unfair hostility was lacking: even the post-office officials in Omaha refused to deliver copies of the *Voice* that came regularly through the mails.

---

[1] Dr. Miller cherished the impression that his correspondent was a representative of a New York liquor organization which was considering the advisability of contributing $5,000 to the Nebraska anti-Prohibition campaign fund, in the hope that the defeat of the Amendment in Nebraska would check the Constitutional Prohibition agitation in New York.

[2] See the *Voice*, Oct. 2, 1890.

J. B. Greenhut, President of the Whiskey Trust, in a confidential letter printed in the *Voice* for Oct. 9, 1890, wrote:

"We claim that we have done more toward carrying on the legitimate expenses of that [Nebraska] campaign than any other institution in the country. . . . We may not have contributed as much as some people out there think we should have, but if we should pay out such enormous sums as are sometimes demanded from us we might as well go to the poor-house at once as attempt to meet such demands."

[3] Even the Mayor of Omaha had estimated the population in 1889 at only 110,000. (See the "*World* Almanac for 1889." p. 171.)

The returns gave an aggregate vote of 82,292 for Prohibition and 111,728 against. The License Amendment received 75,462 votes, and 91,084 were cast against it.

Negroes.—Remembering the circumstances in which the Afro-American was placed by the dreadful institution of slavery it is not to be wondered at that he now cultivates a taste, even a love, for alcohol. Yet it is remarkable to note the progress toward sobriety that the race has made in the later years of its emancipation. A colored total abstainer is not a rare person in any community nowadays. The various temperance societies and nearly all the other secret organizations supported by the Afro-American race uniformly require those who seek admission to pledge themselves to be sober men and women, and in most cases to be total abstainers. The drift is more and more in this direction, and hence soberness in the race is constantly on the increase. It is remarkable, too, to observe the steadfastness and persistency with which colored teachers, as a rule, hold to the idea that the race is to be uplifted morally, as well as materially and religiously improved, through total abstinence as a chief instrument. It is the rare exception, not the rule, to find a colored teacher who does not hold to this doctrine. The result is that many boys and girls in the school-room all over the South and in other sections as well are being trained to habits of temperance, and will in all probability develop into consistent temperance men and women. And it must not be forgotten that the true and most influential leaders of the race, the ministers, are moulding and shaping the opinions of both old and young in favor of soberness and total abstinence. The unanimity with which the churches of all denominations declare for the temperance reform is most encouraging. It is a very rare thing to find any considerable proportion of the ministry of any religious denomination exerting an influence in behalf of the extension and perpetuation of the liquor traffic. The church as a factor in this race development and elevation is laboring steadfastly and earnestly for the right. It is the one force that checks and holds the individuals of the race from following the evil propensities of their own hearts when every other force proves unavailing. In it is the chief hope for the present as well as the eternal salvation of the negro. If the church is kept pure it can lift up and give honor and perfect freedom to the freedmen. The race has implicit confidence in the truth and value of God's Word. This confidence must not be shaken but must be cultivated by the selection of clergymen well qualified by special training to teach wisely, acceptably and properly. Along with such cultivation will inevitably go a determination to strengthen the temperance cause more and more.

I have watched closely the men who are recognized as the race leaders in various States and localities. It is acknowledged that they are generally shrewd, calculating and hard to circumvent when they attempt political manœuvres. It is my observation that these leaders are strictly reliable and trustworthy when confided in and—however surprising the statement may be to some—that they are generally sober, upright and honest. I confess that in some localities this rule does not apply, but on the whole a more sober class of leaders does not exist in any race than in the Afro-American.

One of the evils against which our people have to contend is the cross-roads grocery-store, to be found all over the Southland—the bane of this section. Here, with no city or town ordinance to make drunkenness an offense and to threaten certain punishment, they congregate and drink their fill, carouse, engage in free fights and do other hurtful and equally unlawful things, while no one dares molest or make afraid, and the grocery-keeper, finding his trade benefited, encourages the debauchery. This evil instead of becoming less increases. The business of many prosperous towns and villages is being injured seriously by the competition at the cross-roads and the resulting vice, violence and impoverishment. The records of the Courts would show that crime among our people is traceable in a large majority of cases to a too free exercise of the liquor habit. Of the men belonging to the race who are hanged, I think it entirely reasonable to say that at least four-fifths committed their offenses while under the influence of liquor. But speaking of the race broadly, and duly considering all the unusual circumstances that ought to be taken into consideration, I think it cannot fairly be charged with anything like gross intemperance. It is something out of the usual order to come upon a case of delirium tremens among the negroes. Comparatively few of them drink anything of consequence during the week, but excessive imbibition is mostly indulged in on Saturdays. With their vigorous physical constitutions they are able, in six days of comparative temperance, to resist the undermining effects of the seventh day's spree. Therefore this is not a race of drunkards, and there is abundant reason for believing that with proper education and training it may be made a race of sober people and abstainers.

In all the Prohibition and Local Option contests in the South numbers of colored men have been on the side of temperance and fought valiantly for its success. Many others would have thrown their influence the same way had they not been duped by misguided leaders who raised false cries of alarm, declaring that Prohibition was a device to take away the dearly-bought liberty. It is customary to blame the negroes for the defeats of Prohibition in Texas, in the second Atlanta contest, etc.; but it must be remembered that without a large share of the negro vote Prohibition could not have carried in Atlanta at the first trial and would have been lost in hundreds of other fights.

In order to strengthen the cause of temperance in the South nothing is more important than to treat the negro fairly, to keep faith with him, to permit no pledge to be broken. Once won, the colored man is the most faithful and reliable of allies. It is of course needless to add that the supply of temperance literature should be kept up and increased. Especially valuable is the work of arousing total abstinence enthusiasm among the students in the various educational institutions—young men (and women, too) upon whom the future of the race and its influence for good or evil so largely depends. The tracts and other publications of the National Temperance Society have had and are having a most helpful effect; and the literature emanating from the publishers of the *Voice*, from the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and from other societies and organizations bears good fruit.

I am indeed hopeful for the future of the Afro-American race, and particularly hopeful that it will become a positive and influential contributor to the triumph of the temperance reform.

J. C. Price.

(President National Afro-American League.)

[The editor is also indebted to W. H. Crogman, Clark University, and to Frances E. W. Harper. For statutory prohibitions of the sale of liquor to negroes in the slavery days, see the digests of Southern State laws in Legislation.]

Nevada.—See Index.

New Hampshire.—See Index.

New Jersey.—See Index.

New Mexico.—See Index.

New York.—See Index.

Non-Partisanship.—The opinion is held by many that sentiment, legislation and the enforcement of law against drink and the drink traffic will be most judiciously and successfully promoted by carefully cultivating the favor of all political organizations, refraining from a general policy of partisan exclusiveness, patiently watching for local as well as wider opportunities to control the action of the powerful political parties, and seeking to encourage and reward individual friends and punish and defeat individual foes in a discriminating way rather to urge an uncompromising demand for complete and uniform acquiescence. At present the adherents of the "non-partisan" view outnumber by far its opponents. A fair comparison may be obtained from the election statistics of Pennsylvania: in June, 1889, 296,617 Pennsylvanians voted for the principle of Prohibition, but five months later only 21,308 votes were cast for the State ticket of the Prohibition party. Thus of the avowed friends of the cause in that State, 275,000 as against 21,000 seemed to disapprove uncompromising partisan advocacy of it.

It is claimed, however, by the representative "non-partisans," that their interest in the political advancement of Prohibition is no less earnest than that of the party Prohibitionists. They recognize with equal willingness that Prohibitory measures can be won and enforced only through the employment of political agencies. But they believe that it is inexpedient in the existing condition of American politics to set up a distinctive Prohibition party, especially since such a party has hitherto been unable to elect its candidates in any State or Congress District.

On the other hand it is pointed out that every important policy, to win its way to success, must have responsible and faithful championship; that such championship has not been accorded to Prohibition by either of the great political parties; that local popular victories for the principle, however significant, will be more or less unavailing so long as the dominant party is not bound to the principle unmistakably; that even hearty local support of Prohibition by the party that is locally dominant is not satisfactory so long as the same party in adjoining localities and in the country at large manifests hostility or indifference; that the anti-saloon issue can be best kept before the attention of the people by the consistent insistence of those who understand the fruitlessness of half-way measures in dealing with such an institution as the liquor traffic, and who are frank enough to avow their entire programme and demand conformity to it rather than mild concessions, and that the existence of an aggressive Prohibition party, however feeble, being a constant menace to the more powerful parties, will discipline them more effectually than unorganized individuals can possibly do, impel them to grant more progressive legislation than they would otherwise enact and ultimately divide party lines on the Prohibition question.

Experience has not justified the "non-partisan" idea, or at least has not done so on broad grounds. Results bear a close resemblance to those that came from the "non-partisan" method during the Anti-Slavery agitation. Opposition to slavery was undoubtedly cherished, abstractly, by a majority of the followers of both the leading parties at the North long before the war; but these followers, esteeming supposed prudence above radicalism, did not favor a partisan effort in behalf of Abolition; and, striving to cope with the slave power by artful devices, found themselves totally unable to do so, until the Fugitive Slave law and the Dred Scott decision were given them for their pains. The sentiment against the drink traffic is probably as strong as was the feeling for Abolition before the crisis of 1860, but not being identified with general party policy it has enjoyed only local and partial success, while the national political strength of the "rum power" has increased. Among the characteristic "non-partisan" methods are the petitioning of Legislatures, the influencing of primaries, caucuses and conventions, efforts to elect friendly Republican and Democratic legislators, and struggles for the triumph of Prohibition in Local Option and Amendment campaigns. Petitions, though signed by tens and hundreds of thousands of names, have almost invariably been disregarded by legislative bodies unless reinforced by strong Prohibition party votes: in 1883 50,000 persons petitioned the Massachusetts Legislature to submit a Constitutional Amendment to the people, and in 1884 there were 106,000 signatures to the petitions, yet the request was refused each time. Similarly, deputations to Legislatures and Congress, however respectable, have accomplished nothing. As manipulators of primaries, caucuses and conventions the temperance people have seldom been able to match the rumsellers, and when critical decisions have depended on the outcome of such preliminary manipulation their enemies have nearly always outgeneraled them. Attempts to secure majorities in Legislatures by concentrating the temperance vote in each district in favor of the candidate (whether Republican or Democratic) whose attitude on the Prohibition question is most satisfactory, seem to be at first glance both reasonable and hopeful. But such attempts have been inglorious failures. In Ohio, in 1883, a State organization was founded whose objects and fate have been described as follows by its President, Mills Gardner:

> "The Voters' Union in Ohio was formed for the purpose of uniting the voters of Ohio friendly to temperance and Sabbath laws in a non-partisan manner to compel all political parties to respect, by throwing their vote solid for any parties pledged to their support, and also in favor of the Prohibitory Amendment. This Union only continued two years. We found it impossible to unite the voters. Political ties and party bias were too strong, and the thing of course failed."[1]

In Pennsylvania, in 1889, the Union Prohibitory League was established, on a similar basis. Its friends made fervid pleas on the ground of its "practicability," but no success attended its work. Like failures were encountered by the Citizens' Union of Michigan (1887), which declared, in behalf of its members, "That we will use our utmost influence by personal attendance to reform the political caucus and convention, and pledge ourselves to support as candidates for the Legislature those men only who are in favor of Prohibition;" and by the State organization formed in Texas after the defeat of Constitutional Prohibition, whose creed was expressed in these words: "The non-partisan plan of opposition to the traffic is in our judgment the wisest and best; we have seen no reason to distrust this method of work."

The lamentable weakness of the "non-partisan" plan is most instructively demonstrated by the results of recent Amendment campaigns. Before systematic opposition to the Prohibitory movement was aroused it was possible to secure large State majorities for the principle of Prohibition. This was chiefly because the great political parties were then comparatively neutral. But when issues became better defined and determined battle was offered by the "rum power," this neutrality was naturally at an end. The favor of politcal leaders and the influence of political "machines" was then zealously sought by both the temperance and the liquor elements of each party. The masses of the temperance people had held aloof from the "third" party, and they could consistently appeal to the Republican and Democratic managers for friendly or fair action. But it was speedily found that their pleas were without weight: the "non-partisan" Amendments were subjected to the concentrated antagonism of the very men who were responsible for their submission and were ignominiously beaten in State after State. The earlier victories were not "non-partisan" but popular victories, due to the absence of political interest; the later defeats were brought about by nothing more than by the machinations of cold-blooded and unscrupulous politicians, who were able to count upon the continued timidity of the conservative temperance advocates but not upon the submissiveness of the liquor-dealers.

"Non-partisanship" should properly imply lofty, conscientious and persevering independence of and indifference to party. But, as will be conjectured from what precedes, the term, as understood in the Prohibitory agitation, has no such meaning. It signifies, in some exceptional instances, independence of and indifference to all political organizations; but more frequently an intensely partisan opposition to the Prohibition (or "third") party and loyalty to the Republican or Democratic party are suggested. Generally speaking, then, the "non-partisans" are those who object to the particular organization known in American politics as the Prohibition party, and who, far from being without distinct preferences for other organizations, are often heated supporters of them. The claim made by them, that the Prohibition party is an impediment to the cause of temperance, is examined in another article. (See PROHIBITION PARTY—*Results.*)

Although among the people at large a majority of the friends of temperance are "non-partisans" in the sense just defined, there is relatively little sympathy for this species of "non-partisanship" among the recognized leaders and the active agitators. Efforts to organize the opponents of the Prohibition party, as such, into effective working forces, have uniformly been unsuccessful. After the Presidential election of 1884 many eminent individuals, headed by Daniel Dorchester, D.D., and Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, joined in setting on foot a society that became known as the "National Non-Partisan League." Though started under the most encouraging auspices it achieved nothing for the temperance reform, and after issuing a few pamphlets attacking the "third" party it collapsed. A more energetic and longer-lived movement was that inaugurated by the Anti-Saloon Republicans in 1885, distinguished from the other so-called "non-partisan" enterprises, however, by the frankness with which its promoters avowed a strictly partisan design. After a stubborn contest its supporters were forced to disband. (See ANTI-SALOON REPUBLICANS.) The latest organization is the Non-Partisan Woman's Christian Temperance Union, instituted in 1889 and regarded with warm approval by certain sympathizers, but not yet a very potent factor in the anti-liquor cause. (See WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION.)

---

[1] The *Voice*, Aug. 29, 1889.

There exist numerous temperance and Prohibition orders and societies, like the Good Templars, Sons of Temperance, National Temperance Society and State and local organizations, that have a purely educational duty to perform, engage in no partisan recriminations and are absolutely neutral in politics. To these also the name "non-partisan" is given, and their work and objects are not criticised or deprecated in any quarter; their success is steady and gratifying and there is no desire that they shall relinquish the genuine non-partisanship that characterizes them.

North Carolina.—See Index.

North Dakota.—See Index.

Norway.—This country was separated from Denmark and united with Sweden in 1814. Under the Danish dominion distillation had been prohibited in Norway, and only those distilleries that were in existence at the time of the decree were permitted to operate. Consequently in 1814 there was scarcely a distillery in the land. The Government had also prohibited the importation into Norway of all distilled liquors except those shipped from Denmark. The consumption of spirits in 1814 was about ½ gallon per capita. The restrictions on distilling were speedily swept away by the new home Government and in 1816 a policy of free trade in liquor was inaugurated, although the law prohibiting importations of spirits from foreign countries was retained and made to apply to Denmark. In accordance with the prevailing ideas of political economy the object of these measures was to help the agricultural people of Norway. Within a few years stills were found everywhere, and the rural districts were overrun with them. In 1833 there were 9,727 distilleries, and the annual consumption of liquors was estimated at nearly 4 gallons per capita.

Both the people and the Government began to realize the appalling effects of intemperance. As a consequence the liquor question was discussed in the Storthing (National Parliament) in 1833, and laws were enacted regulating and restricting the traffic. Public conscience was awakened and the agitation continued. In 1842 the Storthing passed an act prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of distilled liquors. The leader in this Prohibition movement in the Storthing was Prof. Schweigaard of the University of Norway. But the king vetoed the bill in compliance with the wishes of a small majority of his cabinet. A heavy tax was then imposed on distilleries, greatly reducing the number of the smaller ones.

The law of 1845 with the amendatory statutes of 1848 was the foundation for all the subsequent liquor legislation of Norway. It was practically a license act, vesting the right to sell spirits in a limited number of individuals and providing certain restrictions. It did not touch malt liquors. But about 1840 German beer began to gain favor in Norway, and its consumption increased alarmingly. Accordingly the acts amendatory of the law of 1845 have gradually been extended to beer and wine, and the sentiment of the Norwegian public has kept well ahead of the tendency of the statutes. The most notable additional acts are those of 1857, 1866, 1877 and 1884; and taking advantage of the privileges conferred by them, nearly all the rural communities of the kingdom have adopted local Prohibition of the sale of all intoxicating beverages. Now (1890) only 29 places outside the cities license the traffic, and these are mostly small fishing and tourist stations.

The general effect of license and Local Option in Norway is very similar to that witnessed in the United States. The traffic is entrenched in the cities, from which, apparently, it cannot be dislodged without making a much harder battle than any yet waged. At present only one city, Haugesund (population, 5,000), absolutely prohibits all intoxicants. The arts of politicians have been spent upon these compromise measures not so much with a view to destroying the liquor traffic as for the purpose of checking the radical temperance agitators. And a peculiar system adopted in 1871 (amended in 1884), the so-called Bolag or Samlag system (copied from the Gothenburg plan of Sweden), seems to increase the difficulties under which the Prohibitionists labor. The fundamental object of its projectors was to eliminate from the saloon traffic all incentives to personal gain. In any city a "Bolag" (*i.e.*, stock company) may be organized by the leading business men, and obtain from the City Council exclusive right to sell distilled liquors for a specified number of years in a specified number of saloons. The Bolag drink-shops are kept by salaried officers of the company, who have no interest in the profits arising from sales. Neither have the managers of the Bolag any such interest, directly, for the law requires them to pay into the city Treasury all their net profits; and the city in turn distributes the receipts for charitable and like purposes. At the beginning of 1890 there were 17 Bolag whiskey-saloons in the city of Christiania, besides 11 branch establishments, controlled by the Bolag, in hotels and restaurants. But the right to sell beer and wine is not subject to these restrictions. A beer and wine-shop may be opened in any place not prohibiting the traffic upon payment of a license fee, generally not in excess of $10. In 1890 there were 240 such shops in Christiania.[1] The gross receipts of the Bolag companies of Norway for the year ending June, 1889, were 2,814,113 kroner, or about $760,000.

The Bolag system has been in force long enough to afford an indication as to its value as a temperance measure. The statistics of the leading cities of Norway show that the drink revenues have steadily increased under it. And the police returns are not encouraging. Here, for instance, are the figures of arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct in Christiania for seven years:[2]

YEARS.	DRUNKENNESS.	DISORDERLY CONDUCT.	TOTALS.
1882	6,138	1,869	8,007
1883	6.327	1.900	8,227
1884	5,782	1,918	7,700
1885	7,453	1,822	9 275
1886	5,351	1,602	6,953
1887	5,877	1,877	7,773
1888	5,616	1,689	7,305

As already indicated, many of the present restrictions were added to the law of 1871 by the act of 1884. Omitting the year 1885 from the above table, the arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct do not exhibit any striking changes since the adoption of the Bolag scheme. And the ratio of such arrests to the total population (about 130,000) continues very large—in fact, above the ratio found in most American cities.

But the general temperance outlook appears to be far more cheering in Norway than in any other European country. All comparative estimates of the consumption of intoxicants that the writer has seen show that Norway consumes less drink per capita than any other nation of Europe. Nearly all the officers and influential leaders in the temperance organizations — now containing more than 100,000 members — are strong advocates of National Prohibition of all intoxicants. In 1885 petitions for a thorough Prohibition law, circulated mainly in only two of Norway's six dioceses, received the signatures of 65,604 persons over 21 years of age.

For 10 or 15 years after the first discussion in the Storthing in 1833, there was considerable interest shown in the anti-spirits crusade, and various temperance societies (discriminating in favor of beer and wine) were begun in that period. In 1840 Robert Baird, the American propagandist, visited Norway, and his work against distilled liquors received some recognition. The first total abstinence society was founded Dec. 29, 1859, in Stavanger, by Asbjörn Kloster. It began with 30 members and two years later had 500. It became the nucleus of the present influential Total Abstinence Association of Norway, whose organ, *Menneskevennen* (the *Philanthropist*), now in its twenty-ninth year, was also established by Mr. Kloster. The various local societies held their first general Convention in Bergen in 1862 and organized the Norwegian Total Abstinence Association, with headquarters at Stavanger (removed to Christiania in 1879). Its first President was Mr. Kloster, who held the office until his death in 1876, when the total membership was about 8,000. Kloster eminently deserves the name of the Father Mathew of Norway, her first apostle of temperance—earnest, patient, generous, self-sacrificing, the founder of the present Prohibition work. He labored 10 long years before the society in Stavanger had birth ; he travelled, lectured, distributed tracts and organized societies from Lindesnes to North Cape, and also visited Iceland, the Faroe Islands, England and Denmark. Since Kloster's death the Norwegian Total Abstinence Association has enjoyed phenomenal growth, especially during the last 10 years, under the leadership of Dr. Oscar Nissen and Sven Aarrestad. This development is in no small measure due to the national recognition given its work, the Storthing having voted an annuity of 6,000 kroner (increased to 8,000 kroner) to be used in the temperance cause. (One krone= about 27 cents.) At present the Association embraces more than 700 local societies with a membership of from 75,000 to 80,000.

---

[1] See the *Voice*, Feb. 13, 1890.

[2] Ibid.

The Good Templars, organized nationally in 1878, have nearly 15,000 members in Norway. Their chief is Torjus Hansen. The Blue Ribbon Band was started in 1882 by S. Urdahl, who is still its President ; estimated membership, about 5,000. During the last few years Prohibition societies have sprung into existence everywhere. They are mainly political clubs working to secure National Prohibition. On Feb. 19, 1889, these clubs effected a national organization in Horten, with Dr. Oscar Nissen as President. Men prominent in church and state have enlisted in the ranks of the active workers. In 1887 23 members of the Storthing were total abstainers.

T. S. Reimestad.

The liquor revenue is not so formidable a feature of Government income in Norway as in the English-speaking countries. For the year ending June 30, 1889, the revenue from all sources was 43,132,205 kroner (about $11,645,000), of which 2,800,000 kroner (about $756,000) came from the excise on spirits and 1,800,000 kroner (about $486,000) from the malt duty—total from liquors, about $1,242,000. Apparently the liquor revenue is decreasing: in 1881 it was about $1,560,000 ($945,000 from spirits and $615,800 from beer). The Government tax on distilled liquors is high—from 70 to 85 cents per gallon according to strength. The imports of liquors, relatively, are inconsiderable : in 1889 the spirits imported were valued at only about $700,000. The sanguine hopes of the Norwegian Prohibitionists are encouraged by the fact that the rural population of the kingdom is four times as great as the town population. Statistics show an unusually small percentage of crime, as might be expected for a country so generally under Prohibitory law : in 1885 (in a total population of about 2,000,000) only 3,126 persons were accused of crime, and 2,803 were convicted. There were 150,208 paupers in 1885.

The late well-known Dr. Broch estimated that the annual expenditure for drink in Norway is about $11,000,000, and that each year 7,000 homes are broken up by drink, while the number of drunkards is 15,000, and of those who occasionally become drunk 100,000. According to official reports from the prison directors in Sweden and Norway, 70 to 75 per cent. of the criminals attribute their downfall to drink.

Nott, Eliphalet.—Born in Ashford, Conn., June 25, 1773; died in Schenectady, N. Y., Jan. 29, 1866. Left an orphan at an early age, he was reared in the family of a brother. He taught school to obtain the means to support himself at college. He graduated from Brown University in 1795, studied theology and was licensed to preach by the New London Congregational Association and by it sent as a missionary into central New York. Soon afterward he accepted a call to the Presbyterian Church in Cherry Valley, N. Y., where in addition to his ministerial work he established an academy and became its principal. From 1798 to 1804 he had charge of the 1st Presbyterian Church in Albany, preaching, in the last year of his pastorate, the funeral sermon of Alexander Hamilton which was published in several editions, widely circulated and attracted considerable notice for its eloquence. During the same year (1804) he was chosen President of Union College at Schenectady, and he held this position until his death in 1866, making an uninterrupted term of 62 years. In this period 3,700 to 4,000 young men were graduated from the college. Dr. Nott's investigations in physical science and especially concerning the nature of heat were of a practical nature and resulted in many inventions, for about 30 of which he obtained patents. The first stove devised for burning anthracite coal was his invention and bore his name.

As early as 1811 he made speeches against slavery, and in 1836–7 he delivered a series of ten lectures on temperance before the students of Union College. In these lectures (published in 1846 in No. 4 of Mr. E. C. Delavan's journal, the *Enquirer*, of which an edition of 20,000 copies was issued), Dr. Nott was the first to assert in a serious way the claim that the Bible recognized both a fermented and an unfermented wine, sanctioning the use of the latter only; and from his advocacy of this opinion dates the Bible Wine controversy. Republished in book form the lectures passed through repeated editions both in this country and Great Britain. The following is a specimen of Dr. Nott's pleas to Christians to give up "moderate" drinking:

"The ragged, squalid, brutal rum-drunkard, who raves in the barroom, consorts with swine in the gutter or fills with clamor and dismay the cold and comfortless abode to which in the spirit of a demon he returns at night, much as he injures himself, deeply wretched as he renders his family, exerts but little influence in beguiling others into an imitation of his revolting conduct. On the contrary, as far as his example goes, it tends to deter from rather than allure to criminal indulgence. . . . But reputable, moderate, Christian wine-drinkers,—that is, the drinkers of brandy or whiskey in admixture with wine or other preparations falsely called wine, the product not of the vineyard but of the still or the brew-house,—these are the men who send forth from the high places of society, and sometimes even from the hill of Zion and the portals of the sanctuary, an unsuspected, unrebuked but powerful influence, which is secretly and silently doing on every side, among the young, among the aged, among even females, its work of death. It is this reputable, authorized, moderate drinking of these disguised poisons under the cover of an othodox Christian name, falsely assumed, which encourages youth in their occasional excesses, reconciles the public mind to holiday revelries, shelters from deserved reproach the barroom tippler and furnishes a salvo even for the occasional inquietude of the brutal drunkard's conscience." [1]

In comparing the efforts that had been made in the past to check intemperance by moderation in the use of intoxicants with the efforts then being put forth to enforce total abstinence, Dr. Nott said:

"During the ages gone by the ruinous, loathsome and brutalizing effects of intemperance were extensively experienced and deplored and counteracted. Governments legislated, moralists reasoned, Christians remonstrated, but to no purpose. In the face of this array of influence intemperance not only maintained its ground but constantly advanced, and advanced with constantly increasing rapidity. Death indeed came in aid of the cause of temperance and swept away, especially during the prevalence of the cholera, crowds of inebriates with a distinctive and exemplary vengeance. Suddenly the vacancies thus occasioned were filled up; and as if the course of life whence these supplies were furnished was exhaustless, all the avenues of death were not only reoccupied but crowded with augmented numbers of fresh recruits. The hope even of reclaiming the world by any instrumentalities then in being departed, and fear lest Christendom should be utterly despoiled by so detestable a practice took possession of many a reflecting mind. In that dark hour the great discovery that drunkenness is caused by drinking—moderate, temperate, continuous drinking,—and that entire sobriety can be restored and maintained by abstinence, in that dark hour this great discovery was made and promulgated to the world; a discovery which, simple and obvious as it seems to be, had remained hid for ages, during which no one dreamed that mere drinking, regular, reputable, temperate drinking, injured anyone, much less that it produced, and by a necessity of nature produced, that utter shameless drunkenness which debased so many individuals, beggared so many families and brought such indelible disgrace on the community itself. This discovery, though not even yet generally known throughout the community, has relieved more misery, conduced to more happiness, prompted to more virtue and reclaimed from more guilt,—in one word it has already shed more blessings on the past and lit up more hope for the future than any other discovery, whether physical, political or moral, with which the land

---

[1] Ten Lectures on Temperance (New York, 1857). pp. 204-5.

and the age in which we live have been signalized. By this great discovery it has been made apparent that it is not drunkards but moderate drinkers with whom the temperance reformation is chiefly concerned; for it is not on a change of habit in the former, but the latter, on which the destiny of the State and the nation hangs suspended. Drinking, and the manufacture and sale of that which makes drunkards, operate reciprocally as cause and effect on all the parties concerned. The manufacturer and vendor furnish the temptation to the drinker, and the drinker in return gives countenance and support both to the manufacturer and the vendor. All these classes must be reformed before the triumph of the temperance cause will be complete; and the reformation of either contributes to the reformation of all. Every dramshop that is closed narrows the sphere of temptation, and every teetotaler that is gained contributes to the shutting up of a dramshop, and they must all be shut up—the rum and the wine and the beer-selling grocery,—and temperate drinking relinquished, or drunkenness can never be prevented, society purified from crime, relieved from pauperism, freed from disease, and human life extended to its allowed limits." [1]

The following declaration for the legal Prohibition of the liquor traffic was made in an address at the annual meeting of the New York State Temperance Society, in Albany, Jan. 18, 1856:

"It is in these public and long-established rendezvous of vice [saloons] that the occasion is furnished and the temptation presented. Here the elements of death are collected, here are mingled, and here the fatal chalice that contains them is presented to unsuspecting and confiding guests, as containing an innocent, cheering and even healthful beverage; and, by being so presented in the midst of boon companions, an appeal is made, guilefully made, to the kindly instincts and generous impulses of man's social nature,—an appeal which few long subject to its seductive influences are able to withstand. Merely to shut up these moral Golgothas, these shambles of the soul, would be a noble triumph. But how are these progressive triumphs to be accomplished, this final victory achieved? How? By the force of public opinion—settled, decided public opinion—and such opinion embodied and expressed in the form of authoritative public law,—and thus embodied and expressed as fast and as far as it is formed."

Nuisance.—See INJUNCTION LAW.

Nutrition.—See FOOD.

Ohio.—See Index.

Oklahoma.—See Index.

Ontario.—See CANADA.

Opium.—The chief of the narcotic drugs, manufactured from the juice of the poppy, which is cultivated on a large scale in most of the Oriental countries—notably India and China—but not in Europe or America. It is a powerful and speedily fatal poison. From opium morphia is obtained; the liquid laudanum is another preparation. The principal medicinal uses are to relieve pain and to cause sleep. The habitual employment of opium, even for innocent objects, is almost certain to enslave the user and to create an intemperate and insatiable appetite, leading to physical, intellectual and moral ruin. Such are the terrible fascinations of the drug that its victims, when asked why they do not relinquish it as others relinquish liquor and tobacco, declare: "Yes, whiskey and tobacco may be given up; but opium, never." Coleridge, De Quincy and other famous men have confessed its powers and its evils. The vices of opium-eating and opium-smoking afflict many millions of the human race, and the responsibility for their vast development during the present century is to be charged in no small measure to England, which has steadily sanctioned, fostered and protected opium production and the opium traffic in the East for revenue purposes, and by two bloody wars has compelled China to abandon her policy of opium prohibition. (See CHINA and INDIA.)

In some parts of the United States the opium habit is reaching considerable proportions, and there is reason for believing that it is generally on the increase in this country. This seems to be due most of all to Chinese immigration. Many Chinamen bring the opium habit with them and introduce it here by the force of example and for gain. In the Chinese quarters of San Francisco, New York and other cities opium dens or "joints" are operated and receive patronage from the inebriate, depraved, unfortunate and weak-minded classes of all ranks of society, all nationalities and both sexes. Perhaps no other element of the people constitute so large a proportion of the habitués of these places as the prostitutes. In the opium dens the article is consumed by smoking; a peculiarly made pipe is used, which is the possession of the proprietor; the smoker reclines on a couch and after manipulating the opium so that it will burn satisfactorily lights the pipe and whiffs it, taking the smoke into his lungs and exhaling it through the nose and mouth; lethargy follows, lasting for an hour or a number of hours. By the term "opium-eating" is meant the direct consumption of opium or its preparations by swallowing; to gratify the appetite by this means it is not necessary to frequent a "joint," provided the victim is able to secure the opium, morphia or laudanum at a drug-store and to retire to a place of his own where he may sleep off the effects.

---

[1] Ibid, pp. 240-3.

The opium habit is looked upon with horror by all thinking Americans and Europeans. Yet it may well be doubted whether its consequences to the individual and society, however shocking, are in all respects so disastrous as those resulting from alcoholic liquors. A man under the influence of opium is not violent, destructive or disorderly; life and property are not put in constant danger from the unforeseen caprices of opium narcomaniacs. The repugnance with which the opium habit is viewed by the alcohol-drinking Christian nations may probably be ascribed to the supposedly greater tyranny that it exercises and enervation that it causes, as well as to the fact that it is a peculiarly Oriental vice. Yet this habit, the same as the alcohol habit, has been acquired by many good people; they desire the drug, and must and will have it under any circumstances. In view of such conditions the logic of those who oppose Prohibition of the liquor traffic may be cited with equal or perhaps (considering the superior pleasure said to be conferred by opium and the relatively smaller injury that it inflicts from certain points of view) with even greater justification in behalf of legalizing the sale of opium. If it may reasonably be argued that recourse to Prohibition of alcoholic drink is likely to be inexpedient or ineffectual, why may we not expect to find this argument sustained by the practical results of Prohibition of opium, an article confessedly no less passionately loved than alcohol? And why may not the claim that Prohibition of liquor would fail to diminish the evils of the liquor traffic be tested with some degree of fairness by the fruits of experiments in opium prohibition?

Despite the increase of the habit in certain American cities, it is undoubted that the opium vice, as compared with other vices (and giving due consideration to the extraordinary temptations offered by this drug) plays, on the whole, but an insignificant part in the United States. No reputable person will sell opium for any but medicinal purposes; there is no native production of it; no individual who has a character to maintain will admit that he indulges in it; when the discovery is made that an estimable man or woman is addicted to the practice, inexpressible surprise, grief or condemnation is occasioned; the opium resort is a veritable hell, which no respectable person can afford to patronize; no public temptations of any magnitude are held out to the young or innocent by the opium-dealers; the crime, pauperism, etc., of the community are not traceable to opium to any appreciable extent; the prevailing political evils, misfortunes to families, and the like, are attributed to the opium traffic only in exceptional instances and within narrow limits. The possibility that this traffic may allure and enslave the American public at large is remote in proportion to the hideousness of the pestilent places in which it is conducted and to the emphasis and unanimity with which opium itself is condemned by all intelligent opinion and all statute definitions—condemned without any disposition whatever to admit that it is "one of the good things of God" if used in "moderation." Advocacy of a license system for the retail opium business, as a means of diminishing present evils and deriving a revenue from a vice that manifestly cannot be entirely suppressed, would excite mingled wonder, derision and indignation. It is true that the British Government licenses opium-shops in India; but this course is in keeping with the heartless indifference to the moral welfare of her heathen subjects that England has too frequently displayed: a proposition to license opium-vending at home would never be tolerated by Englishmen.

By the existing treaty of the United States with China it is agreed that no citizen or subject of either country shall be permitted to import opium into the other country; and this absolute prohibition extends to vessels owned and foreign vessels employed by both American citizens and Chinese subjects. (See p. 79.) But the principle of opium prohibition is not embodied in the general statutes of the United States. The

Tariff laws permit the importation of opium in its various forms, although a heavy duty is laid upon "opium prepared for smoking." The present McKinley Tariff act (in force October, 1890) makes the following provisions:

"Opium, aqueous extract of, for medicinal uses, and tincture of, as laudanum, and all other liquid preparations of opium, not specially provided for in this act, 40 per centum ad valorem." (The same duty was charged under the former tariff.)

"Opium containing less than 9 per centum of morphia, and opium prepared for smoking, $12 per pound; but opium prepared for smoking and other preparations of opium deposited in bonded warehouses shall not be removed therefrom without payment of duties, and such duties shall not be refunded." (The former duty was $10 per pound.)

"Opium, crude or manufactured, and not adulterated, containing 9 per centum and over of morphia, free." (Under the former tariff opium of this variety was taxed $1 per pound.)

In the year ending June 30, 1889, no aqueous opium was imported into the United States. Of opium prepared for smoking, 96,678 lbs. were imported, valued at $644,204—all from China, and all brought by American vessels or vessels not owned or operated by Chinese. The quantity of crude opium imported in the same year was 391,563 lbs., valued at $809,893; of this amount 218,637 lbs. (valued at $370,006) came from Turkey in Asia, 99,006 lbs. (valued at $268,355) from England, 35,981 lbs. (valued at $75,857) from Turkey in Europe, 17,951 lbs. (valued at $52,949) from China, 17,448 lbs. (valued at $36,808) from Canada, and the remainder from France, Germany and Turkey in Africa. Thus the annual supply of "opium prepared for smoking," at present available, is less than 100,000 lbs.; and reckoning that 2 lbs. per year is used by each smoker—certainly a very low average if the estimates of per capita consumption of opium in China given on p. 77 are within bounds,—it appears that the number of persons in the United States using the smoking opium imported from China cannot be in excess of 50,000. But it is certain that a considerable part of the nearly 400,000 lbs. of "crude opium" that we import annually is employed purely to gratify the opium habit. However, making the most liberal allowances, it seems highly improbable that the number of habitual opium-users is above 250,000.

The Penal Code of New York has the following provision (§ 388, as amended by Laws of 1889, c. 8, § 1):

"A person who (1) lets or permits to be used a building or portion of a building, knowing that it is intended to be used for committing a public nuisance, or (2) opens or maintains a place where opium or any of its preparations is smoked by other persons, or (3) at such place sells or gives away any opium or its said preparations, to be there smoked or otherwise used, or (4) visits or resorts to any such place for the purpose of smoking opium or any of its said preparations, is guilty of a misdemeanor."

The California Penal Code declares (§ 307):

"Every person who opens or maintains, to be resorted to by other persons, any place where opium or any of its preparations is sold or given away, to be smoked at such place; and any person who at such place sells or gives away any opium or its said preparations, to be there smoked or otherwise used; and every person who visits or resorts to any such place for the purpose of smoking opium or its said preparations is guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $500 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not exceeding six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

In Oregon selling or giving away opium, except to or by druggists, is prohibited, and selling it to be smoked on the premises is also prohibited. Any building where opium is smoked is an opium den. Frequenting opium dens is prohibited. Violations of these prohibitions are punished by imprisonment not less than six months or more than two years in the Penitentiary, by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than one month or more than six months, or by fine of not less than $50 or more than $500. (Oregon Gen. Laws, 1887, §§ 1919–23.) The law of Nevada is similar to that of Oregon, and is worded in very strong language; it prescribes a penalty of a fine not exceeding $1,000, or imprisonment not exceeding two years, or both fine and imprisonment. Other State acts prohibit the traffic in the same unqualified terms.

There is an intimate connection between the opium and drink habits. It is true opium entraps many who are esteemed temperate in the use of alcoholic liquors—nervous and suffering persons who resort to the drug thoughtlessly or for temporary relief, without any intention of acquiring the habit. But probably the great majority of those who frequent the opium dens are individuals whose lives have already been blasted by alcohol. A more potent poison is craved. Indeed, in an enlightened country, where opium has no defenders, a resort to it necessarily implies a singular personal recklessness—such a recklessness as is characteristic of the drunkard.

It is claimed by some designing or misinformed persons that Prohibition of liquor in this country would stimulate the opium habit; and it is even unscrupulously asserted that the use of opium is most prevalent where the liquor traffic is most strictly repressed. In truth, this is one of the favorite arguments of the rumsellers who seek full liberty to pursue their murderous business. It may be granted that if the present intemperate users of drink were unable to obtain liquor some of them who are not now victims of opium would seek this drug; and among a certain class, therefore—a class of unfortunates already slaves to appetite and practically irreclaimable so long as it is possible for them to procure poison,—the opium habit might increase. But even making this trifling and immaterial admission it is yet to be shown that such a substitution of opium for alcohol would in any way aggravate existing evils; while it is certain that a public sentiment so far aroused as to banish beverages hitherto regarded as useful, would stiffen rather than relax the stringent prohibitions against an article always pronounced unqualifiedly injurious. And all experience shows that the prediction made by anti-Prohibitionist alarmists is without foundation. The cities in which the illicit opium traffic is most threatening are those whose liquor policy is especially liberal, like New York and San Francisco; while in the cities where saloons are prohibited and the law is enforced there is absolutely no public development of the opium curse. The Philadelphia *Press* recently addressed a number of questions to the Chiefs of Police of leading American cities, including an inquiry as to the extent of the opium habit. The reports from Prohibition cities showed that in them the opium traffic was so insignificant as to be practically unknown to the police. "The opium habit is not on the increase," wrote the Chief of Police of Augusta, Me.; "The opium or chloral habit is not known in our city," was the report from Topeka, Kan.; the Cedar Rapids (Ia.) Chief declared that "The opium habit is not a feature here," and from Leavenworth, Kan., the information was given that "The opium habit does not prevail."[1]

Oregon.—See Index.

Original Packages.—See UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Palestine.—The Turkish Government takes no notice of the sale of liquor in Palestine from any question of right or wrong involved. A revenue can be derived from its manufacture and sale, and hence a tax is levied upon all who engage in the traffic in any way. In fact the question as to the moral right to make or sell this article is quite foreign both to the minds of private individuals and to public sentiment. Every seller of any and every description of liquor must obtain a license, and curiously enough he must obtain this from the custom-house authorities. Moreover the revenue thus derived is not accounted for to the local Government, either municipal or provincial, but is sent by the custom-house officers direct to Constantinople. The sum which the applicant for a license pays for his shop as rent is ascertained, and an amount equal to one-fourth of this is charged for the license. This rule holds good even among the Jews where many such shops are kept by Jewish women, and the shop is a part of the house where the woman lives.

In the year 1886 there were in Jerusalem alone 130 places where liquor was sold. There are no purely wholesale stores, for the largest liquor merchant sells also by the glass or bottle. Liquor-shops are not open in the evening. The rule for them, as for all other stores, is to close at sunset, and none remain open after 8 o'clock. While liquor is sold openly it should be said that a public "barroom," as that term is understood in America, does not exist in Palestine. This will be partly explained when it is stated that the general custom of the country is for people to purchase liquor, take it home and use it there. On this account fewer drunken persons are seen on the streets than in our own towns and cities.

---

[1] Philadelphia *Press*, Feb. 24, 1889. (See also the *Voice* for March 21, 1889.)

Among the non-Moslem part of the population those who take to liquor-selling most readily are Jews and Greeks. In Jaffa Italians should be added to the list. All about the eastern end of the Mediterranean the common Levantine is a low type of character morally speaking, and when persons of that class think of employment a drinking-shop or a gambling-house is the first thing that occurs to them in the way of business.

Palestine is a land of grapes and the drink of the country is wine. The only liquor which can be mentioned as a rival of wine is arak (called also *rakee*), a distilled article of which there are several grades. It is manufactured largely by Jews from the pomace of grapes after the juice has been extracted for wine, and of refuse figs. The ordinary qualities are very injurious even when taken in moderation. In 1886 it was officially estimated that 1,600 bottles of wine were consumed daily in Jerusalem, and a like number of bottles of arak. Common arak costs 7 cents a bottle, while the better grades cost 15 or 20 cents. Ten per cent. of the amount of arak consumed in Jerusalem is manufactured there; the rest is brought from Cyprus and the Greek islands. Of the wine used 70 per cent. is made there or in Bethlehem, and the rest is imported chiefly from Cyprus. The wine of the country is as a rule pure and very cheap, 5 to 10 cents a bottle being a fair price. This applies of course only to native wines and not to the choicer kinds that are imported. In addition to wine and arak there were in the year referred to as many as 10,000 bottles of beer sold in Jerusalem, besides the amount made at a German brewery near the city and the product of two breweries managed by Italians at Jaffa. This imported beer comes from Odessa and Germany in small quantities, but by far the largest part comes from Austria. The amount of beer that is imported is increasing every year, although the German colonists and the natives who have fallen into the habit of beer-drinking find that in the very hot climate of Palestine they cannot use it with impunity.

Probably 15 per cent. of the Moslem population of Jerusalem drink habitually. The Jews universally use liquor, and the practice is indulged in by a large majority of the Christian population. Indeed, it is rare to find a person who does not use wine or other liquors to a certain extent. Cases of excess and intoxication are far more frequent than is supposed, and among those of whom such a charge would be true are many of the Turkish officers who are from time to time stationed at Jerusalem with its garrison. Details which have been mentioned as true of Jerusalem are equally true of Jaffa, although similar statistics for that city cannot here be given. In towns where the population is exclusively Mohammedan drinking is not common. Whatever may have been true of this class in former times it is a lamentable fact at present that the use of liquor among them is on the increase. In England and America it is frequently alleged that the people of Palestine are comparatively free from intemperance and drunkenness. Statements are made even that the wine of the country, being so pure, will not readily intoxicate. Such statements are pure fictions.

As to efforts in Palestine to check the use of liquor, to show people the evils of the drink habit or to reform those who have come under its curse, none are made. The Mohammedans, who are all fatalists, have no inclination to engage in such work, nor (but for other reasons) have the Jews. Among the handful of Protestants in that country a missionary here and there uses his influence for the correction of the vice, but he reaches only a few isolated individuals. In the Holy Land as in other countries drink is a curse, and neither Government officials nor people have as yet been aroused to remove it. SELAH MERRILL.

Passover Wine.—A full and connected examination of the truth as to Passover wine demands careful observation of the following order of consideration: (1) of feasts anticipatory, in connection with which wine is not mentioned; (2) of the early observances without wine; (3) of the successive statutes and observances where wine is mentioned; (4) of the two other Hebrew feasts, namely, the Feast of Weeks or Pentecost, at which the use of wine is implied, and the Feast of Tabernacles, where it is described, and (5) of the corruption of ancient Hebrew customs among non-conforming Jews and their preservation among conforming Jews since the final destruction of Jerusalem and of the Jewish State.

It is noteworthy that feasts of families and tribes are mentioned as having been general customs in the earliest ages, as those of Job's sons (Job 1:4, 13), at which the use of wine is mentioned; of Lot where it is implied (Gen. 19:3, 32); of Abraham, Isaac and Laban (Gen. 18:6; 21:8; 26:30; 29:22), at which the use of wine is not mentioned, and of Pharoah, where the use of wine is mentioned (Gen. 40:11, 20, 21). Prior, moreover, to any appointment of a Hebrew feast Moses mentions the religious banquet as a custom apparently then existing (Ex. 5: 1; 10:9). The absence of mention of the use of wine at most of these feasts must be observed in order to impartially study the early history of the Passover where no wine is mentioned, and also to judge intelligently of the character of the wine used at feasts before and after Moses's appointment. (See the second part of BIBLE WINES.)

The early history of the Passover, from the Exodus to its first observance in the land of promise, makes no mention of wine, the emphasis always being on the provision that there shall be no "leaven." The first appointment fixes the day as the "beginning" of the civil year, corresponding to that noted in all American proclamations; it indicates that the three provisions, roast lamb, bitter herbs or uncooked salads, and unleavened bread, were provisions of haste, as in camps; and it provides that all refugees who had by circumcision united with the Jewish people, and none others, should partake of the feast (Ex. 12: 8, 11, 15, 38, 41). This original appointment makes the special emphasis to rest on the exclusion of everything "leavened" from the house (v. 19), while later history teaches that the first perversion of the feast brought down a social curse (Ex. 32:1-6). It is specially to be observed that the use of wine seems to have been directly deferred until they came into the "land flowing with milk and honey" or grape-syrup (Ex. 13:5; 22:29 and 23:14–19; Lev. 23:5, 6, 10, 13). The *time* of these three anticipatory provisions is noteworthy: the first immediately upon the original appointment, the second made by the statute a part of the brief civil code to rule Israel in the camp-life of 40 years, and the third written during the year preceding the second Passover (Lev. 27:34). The first allusion to wine (Ex. 22:29) in the Hebrew term "demagh" (in the Greek "aparchas lenou"), only once found, is specially noteworthy; the word "demagh" (as the Greek translation made by Hebrews, the English translation "liquors," and the statement of Fuerst, the ablest Hebrew archæologist, all indicate) alludes to the juice that bursts the grape-skins and trickles in tear-drops—the Greek "protropos" or "dakraon," the Roman "protropum" or "lachrymæ" and the "lachrymæ Christi" or tears of Christ of the Middle Ages,—which was the purest of unfermented wine.

In the record of the second Passover, observed at Mt. Sinai at the close of their year spent there (Num. 9: 5), four important connected facts are presented. In Num. 6: 1-21 the law of "Nazarites" is given as an already existing order, bound in all future history to abstain from fermented wine (Judg. 13: 4, 7; 1 Sam. 1:11, 15; Jer. 35: 6-8; Luke 1: 15); while also at seasons of special care, lest as in the case of Noah an intoxicant might be taken, abstinence for a season from all products of the grape was a part of their vow, from which they might be released at festivals (Num. 6: 2-4, 13, 15, 17; Judg. 13: 14). It is manifest that this class could not be excluded from the Passover, whose observance immediately followed, while, too, the wine provision alluded to in Ex. 22:29 is not excluded by the Nazarite vow. In the observance immediately following, though strict care as to unleavened bread, fresh salad and lamb fresh and not left until morning (Num. 9: 11, 12) is to be observed, no mention of wine is made.

Only a few days after this observance a third illustration of provision for the Passover occurs. The spies entering the land of promise bring back a grape-cluster so large and rich that two men are needed to carry it on a pole between them (Num. 13: 20–23), the "season of the first grapes" being manifestly designed to enforce the law as to wine at the Passover, not to be observed again until they reached the land where this provision would be permanent. Immediately upon this hinted supply follows the fourth fact, the statute requiring that all offerings to the priest and at festivals of vine-products be "fresh, unfermented wine" (Num. 18:12). (See UNFERMENTED WINE.) It is this cumulative testimony , all to one point, that forbids any idea that other than unfermented wine was divinely appointed as Passover wine. The next observance of the Passover, 39 years later, and when they had in the early spring just entered Canaan (Josh. 5:10, 11), makes no mention of any other than "unleavened bread" as the provision made. In the renewed statutes of Moses (Deut. 16:2–6) and in successive allusions to the observance (II Kings, 23:22, 23; II Chron. 30:15; 35:1, 11, 18; Ezek. 45:21 and Ezra 6:19, 20), no mention of wine seems necessary; while its designation down to Christ's day is simply as the "feast of unleavened bread" (Ex. 12:7; 23:15; 34:18; Lev. 23:6; Deut. 16:16; II Chron. 8:13; 30:13,21; 35:17; Ezra, 6:22; Ezek. 45; Matt. 27:17; Mark, 14:1 and Luke 22:1).

The emphasis with which "unleavened bread" was required, with scarcely an allusion to the wine, and the fact that both statutes mentioning the wine to be used declare it to be the "fresh, unfermented juice of the grape," both justify and compel the decision that the wine of the Passover, by divine appointment, must be free from ferment.

The provisions for the later feasts add confirmation to this manifest appointment. The Passover came in the spring before the grapes which furnished fresh wine ripened, but the methods of preserving "unfermented wines" in Egypt were of Egyptian origin, and were practiced at least three or four centuries before Moses lived and became master of "the wisdom of Egypt."

The second, or "Feast of Weeks" (Ex. 34:2; Deut. 16:10; II Chron. 8:13), called in the Greek Apocryphal books written after Alexander's day the "Pentecost" or Fiftieth Day Feast, occurring seven weeks or 49 days after the Passover, was at the season of early vintage, for it was at this feast, three times mentioned in the New Testament (Acts, 2:1; 20:16; I Cor. 16:8), that Peter and his brother Apostles were charged with being full of "new wine" (Greek "gleukos").

The Feast of Tabernacles came in the autumn, at the "in-gathering" of the later vintage (Lev. 23: 3, 4, 43; Deut. 16:16; Neh. 8:4–18); the only mention of the wine used being (Neh. 8:10) in the Hebrew word "mamthagim" (Greek "glukasmon"), or the rich, "sweet" juice of the grape-clusters pressed out when the skins begin to shrivel from the evaporation of the water, which makes the juice syrup-like. Thus every allusion to the wine of the three Hebrew feasts indicates that it is unfermented. The final confirmation is found in the fact that Jesus, speaking of the Passover cup (Luke 22:18) which preceded the breaking of the bread and became the cup of his new ordinance (vs. 19–20) says: "apo tou genēmatos tēs ampelou"—"of the fruit of the vine."

The Talmud has often been quoted as indicating that intoxicating wine was used at the Passover by the Hebrews after the final fall of their city and State; but these facts and principles are noteworthy: (1) The divine ordinances, as all of the Prophets and as Jesus and Paul declare, were grossly violated in the days both of prosperity and adversity, and the question is not what some Hebrews did, but whether the law of the Old Testament, just considered, justified such actions—whether when drunkenness is declared a sin, intoxicating wines—and these drunk to intoxication—were God's appointment for his solemn feast; (2) While the Talmud would never be quoted as authority by any Christian teacher who realizes his responsibility, the fact should be stated that in the very age of the Talmud and in every generation since, its authority with "orthodox" Rabbis has not been decisive; and (3) Though studious efforts have been made to draw from non-conforming Rabbis statements that the wines of their Passover are now and have ever been intoxicating, the following statement of Judge Joachimsen (so long and highly esteemed in New York and lately deceased) has not only not been contravened but has been confirmed by even the most liberal Rabbis. In response to a request for a written statement of a former verbal declaration the following note was received by the writer of this article :

"336 East 69th Street, New York, Feb. 15, 1881.—*Rev. and Dear Sir:* In answer to your favor of yesterday's date, I repeat that the great majority of conforming Jews in this city use wine made from raisins at the Passover Feast. Of course the raisins are *fresh*. Such raisin-wine is used in all conforming synagogues for the sanctification of the Sabbath and holy days, *i.e.*, for Riddush and also for services at circumcisions and weddings. Some, but not many, people use imported wine—Italian, Hungarian or German,—which is certified as 'Perach' or 'Kosher wine.'—I am most truly yours,
"P. J. Joachimsen."

It thus appears that the wines used by all conforming Jews are free from ferment, and Judge Joachimsen in a subsequent note refers to synagogues of New York City Jews from "Tangiers, Morocco, Tunis" on the African coast; from "Gibraltar, Spain and Portugal;" also "French, Hollandish, English, German, Russian and Bohemian, Polish and Lithuanian,"—all conforming synagogues.

Among the very few non-conforming Rabbis who replied to Dr. Howard Crosby's circular in the summer of 1888, Rabbi Gottheil writes as follows, on behalf of his "liberal" as distinguished from his "orthodox" fellow-Rabbis:

"It is proper to use fermented wine. . . . Unfermented wine is permitted, in case the former (or Kosher wine) cannot be obtained, or is forbidden for sanitary reasons. So is it with mead, raisin-wine and spiced wine."

It is again to be recalled that in every Old Testament mention that is specific, unfermented wine is that required at Hebrew feasts, and it is to be noted that Rabbi Gottheil admits the *existence* and *proper use* of both unfermented and raisin-wine. The latter (we may confidently allege) has been universally used by Jews who adhere to the letter of their law. No one questions that Jesus was a "conforming Jew," and he characterized the wine of the Passover as "the fruit of the vine." G. W. Samson.

Pauperism.—The responsibility of drink for extreme poverty is one of the chief grounds for assailing the traffic in liquors and seeking its extinction. It is impossible to allude to the evils caused by alcohol without placing pauperism well at the front: indeed, in enumerating these evils it is customary to mention crime first and pauperism second.

The statistics of pauperism given by the United States Census for 1880 are defective and practically valueless. The total number of paupers in the country during that year is placed at only 88,665, of whom 67,067 were inmates of institutions, and 21,598 were "out-door paupers." As an example of the unreliability of these returns, the aggregate for Massachusetts is only 5,423; but the Massachusetts State Census for 1885 reports 8,394 adult paupers and 5,332 homeless children—a total of 13,726. It is impossible, therefore, to determine, even with reasonable approximation, how many paupers there are in the United States. The stated number of inmates of almshouses in 1880 (67,067) may probably be accepted as sufficiently accurate; but there is no doubt that this is greatly exceeded by the number of persons not lodged in public institutions (including tramps and vagrants) who depend more or less upon charity and are to be regarded as practically in a state of pauperism. Neither do the Government returns show the causes of pauperism. To arrive at an intelligent understanding of these causes, and especially of the part played by drink, it is necessary to consult expert testimony; and fortunately this is to be had in abundance.

While there are no satisfactory figures for the United States at large, some valuable investigations have been made in separate States and localities. For years the social statistics of Massachusetts have had a very high reputation for trustworthiness. This is one of the richest and most intelligent States of the Union, where the percentage of pauperism chargeable to drink is probably not uncommonly high. The results of official inquiries in Massachusetts are thus summarized by a writer occupying one of the most prominent judicial positions in the Commonwealth:[1]

"The pauper returns, made annually for a long time to the Secretary of State, show an average of about 80 per cent. as due to this cause in the county of Suffolk (mainly the city of Boston). Thus, in 1863, the whole number relieved is stated at 12,248. Of these the number made dependent by their own intemperance is given as 6,048, and the number so made by the intemperance of parents and guardians at 3,837, making an aggregate of 9,885. The 3d report of the Board of State Charities, p. 202 (January, 1867), declares intemperance to be 'the chief occasion of pauperism,' and the 5th report says: 'Overseers of the Poor variously estimate the proportion of crime and pauperism attributable to the vice of intemperance from one-third in some localities up to nine-tenths in others. This seems large, but is, doubtless, correct in regard to some localities, and particularly among the class of persons receiving temporary relief, the greater proportion of whom are of foreign birth or descent.' In the 6th annual report of the Board of Health (January, 1875), p. 45, under the head 'Intemperance as a Cause of Pauperism,' the Chairman, Dr. Bowditch, gives the result of answers received from 282 of the towns and cities to the two following questions: '1. What proportion of the inmates of your almshouses are there in consequence of the deleterious use of intoxicating liquors? 2. What proportion of the children in the house are there in consequence of the drunkenness of parents?' While it appears that in the country towns the proportion is quite variable and less than the general current of statistics would lead one to expect, which is fairly attributable in part, at least, to the extent to which both law and public opinion has restricted the use and traffic in liquors, yet we have from the city of Boston, the headquarters of the traffic, this emphatic testimony from the Superintendent of the Deer Island Almshouse and Hospital: 'I would answer the above by saying, to the best of my knowledge and belief, 90 per cent. to both questions. Our register shows that full one-third of the inmates received for the last two years are here through the direct cause of drunkenness. Very few inmates (there are exceptions) in this house but what rum brought them there. Setting aside the sentenced boys (sent here for truancy, petty theft, etc.), nine-tenths of the remainder are here through the influence of the use of intoxicating liquors by the parents. The great and almost the only cause for so much poverty and distress in the city can be traced to the use of intoxicating drink either by the husband or wife, or both.'[1] A startling testimony as to the effect of this cause in producing the allied evil and even nuisance of vagrancy is given in the answer from the city of Springfield: 'In addition to circular I would say that we have lodged and fed 8,052 persons that we call "tramps," and I can seldom find a man among them who was not reduced to that condition by intemperance. It is safe to say nine-tenths are drunkards, though we have not the exact records.'"

---

[1] Robert C. Pitman, in "Alcohol and the State" (New York, 1886), pp. 30–32.

The report of the Secretary of State of New York for 1863 says that during the year "The whole number of paupers relieved was 261,252; during the preceding year, 257,534. These numbers would be in the ratio of one pauper annually to every 15 inhabitants throughout the State. In an examination made into the history of those paupers by a competent committee, seven-eighths of them were reduced to this low and degraded condition, directly or indirectly, through intemperance." And the Commissioners of Charity and Correction for New York City said in their report for 1880:

> "The causes of pauperism and consequent disease and crime have received careful and thorough investigation by those long enjoying favorable advantages of observation. Many reasons for this painful and rapidly increasing pauperism among the people have been assigned, but that which takes precedence above and beyond all others is the curse of intemperance. It is this which robs the pockets of the poor man; it is this which benumbs his brain and destroys his faculties, and this which predisposes himself and his children to fatal disease. It is this which breeds sensuality in all its protean and disgusting forms, this which induces shiftlessness and irresponsibility among the masses, and it is this which saps the life from those who would otherwise be healthy and vigorous. The statistics of almshouses, workhouses, penitentiaries, asylums and hospitals all attest this dark and gloomy fact. . . . If the malignant character of this enemy of the people's health, and its far-reaching tendencies toward disease and death, were more thoroughly understood, a revolution in sentiment on the question might the more speedily be inaugurated."

Howard Crosby, D. D., one of the men least disposed to indulge in exaggerated statements, has made this declaration: "I have been watching for 35 years and in all my investigations among the poor I never yet found a family borne down by poverty that did not owe its fall to rum."[2] And Horace Greeley, in a *Tribune* editorial, said: "Most of our paupers have become such through the use of alcoholic liquors—often by themselves, sometimes by their parents or other guardians. We estimate that nine-tenths of the paupers in our country were made so directly by strong drink."[3]

The *Voice*, in 1886, sent letters to a large number of Superintendents of Almshouses and Poor Directors concerning the relations existing between destitution and drink. William Murray, Superintendent for 19 years of the Kings County Almshouse (Brooklyn, N. Y.), said: "My opinion is that liquor is the principal cause of pauperism. If there had been no liquor drank, say for the past 100 years, there would be almost no pauperism and there would be no poor-houses." Among the estimates given from various cities and towns of the percentage of pauperism occasioned by drink were the following:

---

[1] The "Associated Charities of Boston," an organization composed of 51 charitable societies and 29 similar church institutions of the city, say in their second annual report: "In the following reports from the Ward Conferences there is universal testimony that drunkenness is the cause of nine-tenths of the pauperism in Boston. How to counteract this evil is the first subject presented to this body for consideration."—*Alcohol in Society*, p. 111.

[2] The *Voice*, Dec. 9, 1886.

[3] Alcohol in Society, p. 108.

Worcester, Mass.: Among the males, 90 per cent.; females, 70 per cent.
Albany, N. Y.: About nine-tenths.
Meadville, Pa.: Nine-tenths. (Estimated by O. H. Hollister, who had been Clerk of the Directors of the Poor of Crawford County for 15 years.)
Lanesborough, Mass.: Nine-tenths.
North Brookfield, Mass.: Fully two-thirds.
Lima, Pa.: Not less than 75 per cent.
St. Charles, Mo.: From 75 to 85 per cent.
Shelly, N. C.: At least two-thirds.
Bowling Green, O.: Nine-tenths.
Minneapolis, Minn.: At least 80 per cent.
Hamilton, O.: Three-fourths. [1]

Strong light has been thrown upon this subject in England. Sir Wilfrid Lawson is authority for the statement that in Glasgow the Lord Provost, during a certain number of weeks in which he had administered relief to the distressed, "had asked every applicant if he was a teetotaler, and found he had not one teetotaler come before him for relief." [2] In 1864 a careful inquiry was made into the circumstances of 611 paupers in the Edinburgh City Poor-house, these 611 being all the persons contained in that institution at the time, "and it was found that among them all there was not a single abstainer and that 407 of them had been 'reduced to their impoverished condition through drink.'" [3] The following extract is made from a report of a Convocation of Canterbury: "It can be shown that an enormous proportion of the pauperism, which is felt to be such a burden and discouragement by the industrious and sober members of the community, and has such a degrading and demoralizing effect upon most recipients of parochial relief, is the direct and common product of intemperance. It appears, indeed, that at least 75 per cent. of the occupants of our workhouses and a large proportion of those receiving outdoor pay have become pensioners on the public directly or indirectly through drunkenness and the improvidence and absence of self-respect which this pestilent vice is known to engender and perpetuate." [4] Gen. Booth of the Salvation Army, in his book, "In Darkest England" (1890), gives the following estimates of the numbers of paupers, destitute and nearly destitute persons in the city of London: Paupers, 51,000; homeless, 33,000; starving, 300,000; the very poor, 609,000 — total, 993,000. Gen. Booth lays stress upon drink as one of the great causes of all this poverty.

Penalties.—The penalties against the unlawful sale of intoxicating drink imposed in the different States have to a great extent been copied from the statutes of New York, and it is remarkable that the New York penalties have not been essentially changed in 50 years. While public sentiment has been altered materially and the habits of the people have undergone a still more striking alteration the penalties imposed for violating the liquor laws are to-day substantially the same as they were when it would have been considered an affront or an act of inhospitality not to offer the social glass. The merchant in the olden time peddled out his rum with his groceries and dry-goods. The clergyman and the flock were social drinkers, and not infrequently the distillery was side by side with the flour-mill and close by the house of worship. It was not a sin to drink, or a crime to become intoxicated, in any person's estimation. Yet to sell drink without first obtaining a license, under these easy conditions, notwithstanding the poverty of our ancestors, was severely punished by a fine of $50. Now all is changed—except the penalty. In those days the public inn barely supported the family of the host. Now a public bar can be run almost anywhere and its owner pay a $50 fine once a month, if necessary, and reap besides a large profit. Fortunes were not made in a day, and $50 was a large amount to be taken from the income. Now a "fast" man will spend much more than this in a night's carouse. Then crime, poverty, insanity and pauperism had not been laid with statistical accuracy at the door of the traffic. Saloons were unknown. The politics of the country was not ruled by an oligarchy of brewers and distillers. It is not wonderful that under such circumstances a fine of $50 for an unlicensed sale, and one of $10 for selling to a minor, were deemed sufficient penalties. But it seems inexplicable that in these closing years of the 19th Century, with the iniquity of so devilish a traffic standing out in a blazing light, the penalties even against the unlawful sale of intoxicants remain practically as they were 50 years ago. And the belief that no Prohibitory legislation can be enforced is entertained by intelligent persons, forgetting the undeniable fact that for offenses against the public weal no penalties are so weak, no charges so difficult to prove and finally no prosecutions so expensive to the complainants as in cases of violations of Excise laws.

---

[1] The *Voice*, Nov. 25, Dec. 9 and Dec. 16, 1886, and Jan. 6. 1887.

[2] Foundation of Death, p. 242.

[3] Alcohol in Society, pp. 112-13.

[4] Ibid.

The law in a certain locality forbids the sale of intoxicating drink. But what is intoxicating drink? Are cider, small beer, cordials, etc., etc., intoxicating? Suppose we admit that they are intoxicating. How can you prove that the glass of cider sold was not vinegar—both being of the same color? From the nature of the case a witness cannot swear positively unless he drinks from the same glass. Of course with a temperance jury mere quibbles would not avail, but that it is almost impossible to obtain a conviction for illicit sale in many places is notorious. The pigeonholes of District Attorneys are packed with untried indictments, often untried for want of evidence. There is one witness, however, seldom called by the prosecution, for obvious reasons, who does know the character of the drink he sells. He can tell, if cold tea has the color of brandy, whether he sold brandy or tea. He may say that he cannot tell whether small beer or cordial is intoxicating, but the law can meet such instances of ignorance. The difficulty is a very serious one where only an excuse is wanted in the mind of one juror to acquit. But matters would have a different aspect if such an addendum as the following, for example, were attached to the statute: "Provided that if the substance sold or given away shall have the appearance of brandy, cider, etc., etc., such appearance shall be deemed *prima facie* evidence that such substance was brandy, cider, etc., etc., and intoxicating under this statute." The burden of proof would then be shifted. The dealer would have to prove that the substance sold or given away was unintoxicating, or suffer conviction. Trials would be simplified wonderfully. There are abundant precedents for asking for a provision of this nature. For instance, the finding of game out of season in the possession of a person is *prima facie* evidence of unlawful killing. On trial he may prove that the alleged partridge or grouse was only a tame chicken. The liquor-dealer may prove that the alleged brandy was only tea. No wrong is done in either case, and no one can justly complain.

The experience gained under the United States Revenue laws removes all doubt as to the character of the penalties that should be embraced in Prohibitory laws. This experience proves that Prohibition can be enforced. The minimum penalty should be $200 for the first offense; for the second, after one conviction, double, with three months' imprisonment, and a corresponding increase for each new offense. No indictment should be necessary, but a civil action should lie in any Court of competent jurisdiction.

There are certain offenses that shock or endanger the public and are punished, but it is a lamentable fact that we are a nation of law-breakers. Murder, arson and the like are followed by arrest and punishment. But the statute-books are full of laws that are obsolete or habitually disregarded, and none so conspicuously as Excise laws. The reason for the disregard of the latter grows out of the difficulty already hinted at, of proof and conviction, but this is not the main difficulty. The liquor business is entrenched behind ample capital. Its profits enable it, in case of complaint, to procure the best legal talent in defense. The prosecution generally begins by way of indictment, and if a bill is found a year or more may elapse before the trial, which, if favorable to the complainant, is usually appealed from, and another year may be consumed. Meanwhile the dealer's profits enable him to pay the cost of the law's delay. And so long as rum rules politics there will be no haste to convict, even in instances of undoubted guilt—in short, the dice are loaded and the law is defied. During all this time the good citizen who complained, moved by a laudable desire to protect society and see that law is respected and obeyed, is subject to persecution and insult and must out of his own pocket defray numerous expenses, with no reimbursement, even if he gains a conviction. Is it any wonder that Prohibition sometimes does not prohibit under such circumstances? The late Mr. Bergh, who did so much to secure laws to protect animals from cruelty, told the writer that no matter what laws he procured, for years he was obliged to hire attorneys, get witnesses and pay other expenses from his own purse before he could complete the work of justice, and that his difficulties continued until the law was amended so as to provide for moieties. The fact is, the expense of conviction is the one immovable barrier to the complete triumph of Prohibition wherever enacted. The experience of the United States, based upon the experience of the Old World, demonstrates that it is absolutely necessary for the Government to make special inducements for the encouragement of those interested in the prosecution of evil-doers. One plan is to hire detectives by the year or month and compensate them from the public funds, but this method is not wholly satisfactory. Another is to give the informer or prosecutor one-half the fine recovered. There is also great propriety in the policy of making the guilty offender—enriched by his illicit traffic—pay the cost incurred in convicting him. Let the citizen understand that his necessary expenses will be reimbursed if a conviction is had, and he will be better able to cope with the habitual law-breaker. Leave him without such an assurance and he is handicapped from the start—weak where his opponent is strong. These suggestions are not new. Provisions for giving half the fine to the informer and for assessing the costs of prosecution against the convicted rumseller have been embodied in not a few liquor laws. But there has been a strange tendency toward eliminating them—not so strange, either, when it is remembered that the liquor element has always been keenly alive to the importance of escaping severe penalties and that the temperance people have frequently been content with mere nominal Prohibitions.

The drugstore sales of liquor are among the most difficult to deal with. So long as people take whiskey for medicine and drugstores are permitted to vend without effective restraints, so long will anti-liquor acts fail. The rigid provisions of the Kansas Pharmacy law should be applied to the drugstore traffic everywhere—that is, no druggist should have the right to sell, give away or supply any intoxicating beverage except upon written prescription of a practicing physician, and each prescription should be pasted in a book kept for the purpose, the book to be always open to public inspection; while the penalty imposed for illicit selling should be provided and the moiety clause should be added.

A wholesome effect would also be produced if the Kansas plan of requiring Sheriffs, Prosecuting Attorneys, Judges and all officials connected with the administration of law to promptly arrest and try liquor offenders and perform their whole duty as defined by the statutes, on pain of heavy fine and loss of office. Civil Damage acts also should be strengthened. Indeed, there is probably no graver need indicated by present conditions than that of the stiffening of penalties all along the line. Prohibitory laws are not, but penalties are, lamentable failures. Cure the latter and the former will take care of themselves.

JOHN O'DONNELL.

[The editor is also indebted to Edwin C. Pierce. For penalties prescribed in present and former liquor laws, see LEGISLATION, SOUTH DAKOTA and UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.]

Pennsylvania.—See Index.

Permissive Prohibition. — See LOCAL OPTION.

Persia.—Malcolm, in his "History of Persia," relates (vol. 1, p. 10) that wine was discovered in that kingdom in the reign of Jamsheed. He attempted to preserve grapes in a large vessel. Fermentation ensued and the king believed that the juice was poison and bottled and labeled it as such. A lady of the palace, wishing to commit suicide, drank from it. She was pleased with the stupor that followed and repeated the experiment until the supply was exhausted. She imparted the secret to the king and a new quantity was made that sufficed for all. Hence wine is called in Persia the *zahar-i-khosh,* or "delightful poison." Wine was a common beverage of the ancient Persians. Cyrus set a trap for the Massagetæ by deserting his camp and retiring into ambush, taking care to leave a plentiful supply of wine. The intoxicated enemy were easily vanquished. The cup was freely used in the palace of Xerxes. (Esther 1:4–10; 7:2–7.) The vineyards of Lebanon and of distant provinces were laid under contribution by the Persian monarchs.

Drunkenness was checked by the Mohammedan conquest. The Koran declares that in wine "is great sin," and that it is an "abomination of Satan's work." According to tradition, one of the precepts of Mohammed was, "Whosoever drinks wine, let him suffer correction by scourging." For 1,200 years the law of Persia has prescribed penalties of 80 lashes for a free man and 40 lashes for a slave; if the offender is seized while intoxicated or while his breath smells of wine, and two witnesses testify that he has drunk wine, the stripes are to be administered. These provisions have at no time prevented the use entirely. Even some of the Caliphs of Bagdad scandalized the faithful by their intemperate habits. The poets Hafiz, Saʻdi and others praise the wine-cup and sing its delights. Yet during these centuries total abstinence has been adhered to by the people in general. In the last 30 years there has come a deplorable change for the worse. Statistics of the number of drinkers and the consumption of liquors are unobtainable, but no one can doubt that the increase of the evil has been marked. The official, military and wealthy classes are becoming more and more inclined to disregard prohibitions and restraints. On the other hand, tens of thousands of villagers have never tasted liquor in any form and would rather die than take it; they believe that alcoholic drink renders one unclean in the sight of Allah and unfit for paradise. Besides the hundreds of towns where no liquor can be procured, there are several Prohibition cities, notably the sacred cities of Meshed and Koorn. Arthur Arnold says: "In Koorn we found it impossible to refill our empty wine-bottles. Intoxicating liquors appear to be absolutely unobtainable."

In general, the Persian who drinks goes to excess. His idea is that the pleasure consists in the intoxication, and that "there is as much sin in a glass as a flagon." He sees no stopping-place between total abstinence and intemperance. In the cities wine is used by the rich, while the poor drink arrack (a crude spirit). In the villages where the Christians own vineyards seven or eight barrels of wine are often set aside as the winter supply of a family. There are frequent carousals in the long winter months. The Armenian, Nestorian, Jewish and Christian inhabitants, with few exceptions, are drinkers, many indulging in "moderation" but great numbers excessively. Of one town on the Oroomish plain it is said that even the walls get drunk and reel. This rural debauchery is caused by wine, not by distilled liquors. At the New Year, Easter and other festivals it is a common custom to offer guests intoxicants, though tea and coffee are always at hand.

The liquor-vendors in Persia are Jews and Armenians, with some Nestorians. The professing Christians are responsible for much of the corrupting influence that is being exerted. The scattered Armenian communities, which should be centres of gospel effort and virtues, are at the front in the drink propaganda. In many a city the Christian quarter is the drunkard-making quarter. Until recently it has been all but impossible to find a Mussulman wine-seller, and today no follower of the Prophet can engage in the business without danger of being despised and disgraced. But love of money tempts Mohammedans to carry on the traffic where no Jews or Armenians live.

"Open saloons" are rare. In most instances liquor is sold in private houses, out of the public view. Some shops in the bazaars sell bottled European wines and have back rooms in which dram-drinking is permitted. Most of the Mussulmans addicted to the habit carry the stuff home with them and consume it there.

The change that has been wrought will seem the more striking when it is said that the liquor trade is now practically licensed by the Government. The tax is 4 *shohis* per bottle of arrack, which sells for 12 or 15 *shohis* (10 cents). The police extort *backsheesh* (or bribes) from each dealer, aggregating, probably, a larger amount than the Government collects. Thirty years ago, when the evil consequences of the traffic began to excite public attention on account of rowdyism and quarrels in the streets, a crusade was made by Mussulmans in Tabriz against the liquor-shops, the bottles and jars were broken and the drink was spilled. Under cover of the laudatory object, the houses of many Armenians were looted. The crusaders continued their work for four or five years, when a firman from the Shah gave the business legal standing. Later a European resident of Tabriz imported machinery and built a distillery, intending to manufacture on a large scale, but the Government speedily prohibited it. Each seller of spirits, as a rule, produces his own supply. As in America, the "trade" holds itself above ordinary obligations: Friday and Sunday, the two holy days, are the days on which the largest profits are made.

Nearly all of the vast vintage of Persia is turned into raisins and grape molasses. The native wines, with few exceptions, are inferior in quality. They are manufactured by the primitive process, the grapes being crushed by the feet and the juice being put into large earthen jars to ferment. The amount of wine consumed is relatively small; the quantity of distilled arrack used is undoubtedly many times larger, in view of the fact that the freest drinking is in the cities, where practically all the common people who drink at all are arrack-drinkers. Here is another demonstration of the failure of wine to prevent the development of an appetite for the stronger intoxicants. The Persian arrack is almost colorless and is very strong in alcohol.

The American missionaries take a decided stand for total abstinence and urge this virtue upon all converts. Three-fourths of the churches of the Evangelical Syriac Church present the teetotal pledge to their adherents. The influence of the evangelical churches with the Mussulmans is greatly increased by their anti-liquor policy.

Samuel G. Wilson.
(Tabriz, Persia.)

Opium culture is an important industry in Persia. Comparatively little of the drug is consumed at home, but large quantities are exported to China and other countries. In 1872 only 870 cases were exported, but in 1881 the number had risen to 7,700. Pure Persian opium is considered superior to the Indian article and contains a larger percentage of morphia. In the last few years its popularity has suffered because of the unscrupulous adulterations practiced by the producers. Besides, the cultivation of the poppy is now regarded with less favor by the Persian Government, since it has given rise to a tendency to abandon the cultivation of food crops.

Personal Liberty.—Objection is made to Prohibition on the ground that it is an unwarranted invasion of personal rights. The objection has no basis in philosophy or fact. Blackstone thus defines natural liberty:

> "Natural liberty consists properly in a power of acting as one thinks fit, without any restraint or control, unless by the laws of nature."—*Blackstone's Com., vol.* 1, *p.* 125.

Of civil liberty he says:

> "Political or civil liberty, which is that of a member of society, is no other than natural liberty so far restrained by human laws (and no farther) as is necessary and expedient for the general advantages of the public. Hence we may collect that the law, which restrains a man from doing mischief to his fellow-citizens, though it diminishes the natural, increases the civil liberty of mankind."—*Blackstone's Com., vol.* 1, *p.* 125.

Natural liberty, therefore, is that which a man enjoys in a state of nature, while civil liberty is that which is possible in society—namely, natural liberty restricted just so far as the public good requires. To illustrate this: In the exercise of natural liberty a man may throw stones, but he violates civil liberty if he throws stones at windows or travellers. His natural liberty ends where the rights of property and of persons begin. In the exercise of natural liberty a man may walk about in a nude condition, but civil liberty restricts this privilege. His natural liberty ends where the welfare of society begins. In the exercise of natural liberty a man may jump and shout, but if he jump and shout in a public assembly he disturbs the rights of others, and the civil authorities provide for his punishment. In the exercise of natural liberty the savage is without restraint—he robs, kills and tortures; but in an organized social state the results of conduct must be considered, and the public good is the supreme law. A man cannot do as he pleases when he becomes a member of society, but must give up a part of his natural liberty to secure the advantages of social intercourse.

The difference, therefore, between natural and civil liberty indicates the difference between the personal liberty advocates and the believers in Prohibition. The Prohibitionists simply ask that personal liberty shall be limited by public interests. This is the fundamental law of social existence. In obedience to it nuisances are abated. The personal liberty to inflict a nuisance upon the community is not allowed. Towns are put under quarantine; powder-houses are removed; lotteries and the circulation of obscene books are prohibited; the construction of wooden buildings in populous districts and the casting of refuse into the street are forbidden. Personal or natural liberty cannot be urged against these prohibitions, for the public good demands them.

The people have a right, and the Courts have so declared, to regulate or destroy any business that threatens the public welfare. The liquor business is of that character, and in the interests of civil liberty and the general good it should be prohibited. The personal liberty to sell liquor, if it injures society, is no more to be considered than the personal liberty to circulate obscene books or to store gunpowder in the heart of a city. This is the law of the land, as firmly established as the foundations of our Republic and as any other principle of our jurisprudence. It rests on the recognition that the public good is the first thing to be provided for and protected. There are certain rights reserved to individuals by the Constitution which cannot be disturbed by majorities. The Courts jealously guard these rights. The framers of our Government made provision for the civil liberties of the people, and if a law is passed that conflicts with such liberties the judiciary department declares it null and void. But the right to carry on a business that debauches society is not guaranteed by anything in our fundamental law, and when the Supreme Court of the United States was asked to determine whether Prohibition of the drink traffic could be esteemed an undue interference with the privileges of citizens that great and conservative tribunal answered in the negative—answered not once but repeatedly, not by a bare majority but without any dissent, not in view of a single aspect of technical legal questions but in view of all the general and broad aspects in which the subject can be presented; answered by solemnly calling attention to the mighty evils that result from this dirty and damnable business, and by justifying Prohibition on grounds of public morality, health, etc.—in short, by declaring Prohibitory law to be thoroughly in keeping with the paramount purpose of righteous and wise government, to minister to the public welfare. And the sophistries of the personal liberty advocates were so lightly esteemed that, although the brewers paid fees aggregating $16,000 to have them formulated by the cleverest lawyers, the Court decreed that all the enormous capital of hundreds of millions of dollars invested in the "trade" might be wiped out and yet no dollar of compensation could be legitimately claimed; that this might be done and each individual brewer and "poisoner-general" be sent to jail summarily, without trial by jury; that summary proceedings of this nature would in fact be "salutary," and that even the right to manufacture intoxicating drink exclusively for the maker's own use might be denied without possibility of redress. After the question had been under review for more than 40 years in the Supreme Court a decision was handed down that surpassed for radicalism and by the emphasis and solemnity of its phraseology every former deliverance from this bench; and in order that it might have the greatest possible weight and significance this decision was written by the member of the Court[1] whose views were supposed to be less satisfactory to the Prohibitionists than those of any other of the older Justices, and who was on record as having stood alone in opposition to certain conclusions concerning the constitutionality of the law of Kansas. In this last and crowning decision the Supreme Court said:

---

[1] Justice Stephen J. Field. (See p. 93.)

The decision was rendered in the case of Henry Christensen, November, 1890. Christensen was a saloon-keeper, who had been arrested by the Chief of Police of San Francisco for selling liquor without a license. The United States Circuit Court for California had rendered a judgment in favor of Christensen's right to sell, on the ground that a city ordinance of San Francisco which made license dependent upon the written consent of a certain number of property-owners was in conflict with the Constitution of the United States. This judgment the Supreme Court reversed.

> "It is urged that as the liquors are used as a beverage, and the injury following them, if taken in excess, is voluntarily inflicted and is confined to the party offending their sale should be without restrictions, the contention being that what a man shall drink, equally with what he shall eat, is not properly a matter for legislation.
>
> "There is in this position an assumption of fact which does not exist, that when the liquors are taken in excess the injuries are confined to the party offending. The injury, it is true, falls first upon him in his health, which the habit undermines; in his morals, which it weakens, and in the self-abasement which it creates. But as it leads to neglect of business and waste of property and general demoralization, it affects those who are immediately connected with and dependent upon him. By the general concurrence of opinion of every civilized and Christian community, there are few sources of crime and misery to society equal to the dram-shop, where intoxicating liquors, in small quantities, to be drunk at the time, are sold indiscriminately to all parties applying. The statistics of every State show a greater amount of crime and misery attributable to the use of ardent spirits obtained at these retail liquor-saloons than to any other source.
>
> "The sale of such liquors in this way has, therefore, been, at all times by the Courts of every State, considered as the proper subject of legislative regulation. Not only may a license be exacted from the keeper of the saloon before a glass of his liquors can thus be disposed of, but restrictions may be imposed as to the class of persons to whom they may be sold, and the hours of the day, and the days of the week on which the saloons may be opened. Their sale in that form may be absolutely prohibited. It is a question of public expediency and public morality, and not of Federal law. The police power of the State is fully competent to regulate the business, to mitigate its evils or to suppress it entirely. There is no inherent right in a citizen to sell intoxicating liquors by retail; it is not a privilege of a citizen of the State or of a citizen of the United States. As it is a business attended with danger to the community, it may, as already said, be entirely prohibited, or be permitted under such conditions as will limit to the utmost its evils. The manner and extent of regulation rest in the discretion of the governing authority. That authority may vest in such officers as it may deem proper the power of passing upon applications for permission to carry it on and to issue licenses for that purpose. It is a matter of legislative will only. As in many other cases the officers may not always exercise the power conferred upon them with wisdom or justice to the parties affected. But that is a matter which does not affect the authority of the State, or one which can be brought under the cognizance of the Courts of the United States."

It appears, then, that the men who raise the cry of personal liberty against Prohibition set their opinion against the matured and often-enunciated opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States as well as against the necessary limitations of civil liberty. This assurance is characteristic. The brewers, many of whom cannot speak English intelligently, and who frequently find it necessary to conduct their proceedings in a foreign tongue, undertook, in national conclave, after the famous decision in the Kansas cases, to argue the principles of American law laid down in those cases. The argument goes on, as a matter of course; for however it may be with barrooms, barroom argument is not so easily put to an end by the action of the Courts. "Personal Rights" and "Personal Liberty" Leagues have not died out. They propagandize with considerable activity in the large cities, particularly when lawless business is afoot and when uncommon fervor for reform is manifested by the clergy, by the women and incidentally by the police. The personal liberty for which they clamor (although they may not see the logic of their course) is the liberty of the barbarian, the thug, the robber—the liberty of the anarchist; a form of liberty that cannot be tolerated with safety to society.

The opponents of Prohibition misstate the case by saying that the State has no right to declare what a man shall eat or drink. The State does not venture to make any such declaration. A man may debauch himself in private and the State will not interfere, unless the debauchery creates a public nuisance or disturbs the peace. Blackstone covers this point in the following words:

> "Let a man, therefore, be ever so abandoned in his principles or vicious in his practices, provided he keeps his wickedness to himself and does not offend against the rules of public decency he is out of the reach of human laws. But if he makes his vices public, though they be such as seem principally to affect himself (as drunkenness, or the like), then they become, by the bad example they set, of pernicious effects to society; and therefore it is then the business of human laws to correct them."—*Blackstone's Com., vol.* 1, *p.* 122.

One of the pernicious effects to society of the private appetite for liquor is the public drinking-place. The drink habit depends upon a public traffic for supply, and the public sale of alcoholic beverages creates a demand which produces widespread mischief in the community. The public traffic, as well as public drunkenness, comes within the reach of human laws. It is not the private appetite or home customs of the citizen that the State undertakes to manage, but the liquor traffic. That is a public institution, having certain relations to the public good, and if the public traffic disturbs social order and becomes an enemy of the State it can be dealt with as such. This is the ground of Prohibition. The saloon has become a public enemy, a public nuisance, and the public safety demands its removal. Thus are defined the lines on which the battle must be fought.

If by abolishing the saloon the State makes it difficult for men to gratify their private appetites, there is no just reason for complaint. Shall the State legislate for the private appetite or for the public good? It strikes at the public traffic for the public good, and must consider the public welfare, not the private appetite. It is difficult to see what ground the State can have for prohibiting anything for the general good if its right and duty to prohibit the liquor traffic be questioned. If the personal liberty of the liquor-seller or drinker is paramount to the public good, then to curtail the personal liberty of the thief or assassin is tyranny.

Those who oppose Prohibition as an invasion of individual rights are quite willing that the traffic shall be restricted. But restriction as well as Prohibition is an abridgment of personal liberty. The advocate of restriction surrenders his case and logically commits himself to the object of Prohibition; for why is restriction urged? For the public good. Prohibition is established for the same reason, and the question to be decided is, Which best promotes the public good? The consistent personal liberty advocate must stand for a liquor trade as free and untrammelled as the trade in groceries or dry-goods. The restrictionist, by demanding special legislation, admits the dangerous and evil character of the liquor traffic and the need of protecting society. He abandons the doctrine of personal liberty and legislates for the general good. If a Prohibitory law gives more protection to society than a restrictive measure he cannot consistently withhold his support. To fulminate against Prohibition in the name of personal liberty, and at the same time approve a burdensome restrictive law, is to be both illogical and amusing.

In Texas in 1887 the liquor-dealers and their friends held a great meeting at Fort Worth to oppose the Prohibitory Amendment to the Constitution, and in order to have a quiet, respectable time, and make a good impression on the State, they prohibited the sale of liquor on the grounds.[1] They unconsciously gave personal liberty a grievous blow, and their followers cannot reasonably take offense if the people generally copy their example and likewise prohibit the traffic in the interest of order and respectability. In their extremity the Texas liquor-dealers placed themselves squarely upon the platform of the Prohibitionists.

To sum the matter up: The opponents of Prohibition contend for the liberty to disregard moral and social laws. It is the liberty that devils delight in. The friends of Prohibition advocate the largest possible freedom for every citizen, consistently with the welfare of all. It is the liberty that comes with truth and virtue. VOLNEY B. CUSHING.

Petitions.—Petition is an application by a person or persons, or an association of persons, for redress of private or public grievances, addressed to an authority having the power to afford relief. It also sometimes takes the form of a prayer for the establishment of a general policy for the advancement of the health, morals or comfort of the community.

The right of petition was recognized in England as early as Magna Charta. But in early times the object was almost exclusively to serve private or individual purposes, and petition became so common among the subjects of the crown that it soon encroached upon the domain of equity jurisprudence. Men in power sought out excuses for shifting responsibility and referring complainants to another quarter for relief. In those times equity or chancery jurisprudence was in its formative period, and seemed to be so broad in scope and so well adapted to meet all such cases that private petitioners were naturally sent to Courts of Chancery; hence the origin of petitions in chancery. Along with petitions grounded on private grievances came applications of Lords and other titled functionaries for the establishment of the boundary lines of their estates, for determining the number and duties of their retainers and the like; but as it was necessary that these petitions should be in the form of legislative enactments in order that adequate answers might be given to them, they were usually worded in the manner of bills or acts, thus: "We, your Majesty's dutiful subjects, do humbly beseech your Majesty that it may be enacted; and therefore be it enacted," etc. While those documents began as petitions they concluded in the phraseology of legislative acts or bills; hence the familiar "bills in chancery." Such proceedings having been taken by distinguished citizens of the kingdom, and having been recognized and acted upon by the crown, the common people were not slow to assert that they should enjoy similar privileges, and so persistent were their claims that Magna Charta made the desired concession. But it was not until the year 1688 that the general privilege was definitely secured to the people, and it was reaffirmed in the Bill of Rights in 1689. Since that time no one has had the temerity to deny the people the right to petition those in authority in behalf of private justice or of public policy. In the United Kingdom the state of public sentiment upon this subject for the last 200 years has been such that a formal denial of the right of petition, whether for private or for public purposes, would inevitably have stirred up a revolution that would have shaken, if not overturned, the throne itself.

---

[1] See the *Voice*, Aug. 4, 1887.

Among the provisions of the United States Constitution is the following: "Congress shall make no law abridging . . . the right of the people . . . to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." The Courts, with practical unanimity, have interpreted this clause by declaring that "The Constitution having expressly prohibited Congress from making any law abridging the right of petition, it follows that no power other than Congress shall make any such law." It would manifestly be a waste of words to point out that the term "grievances" applies not merely to personal but also to public grievances, and covers public nuisances and practices of a criminal nature; while the right to petition for redress includes the right to seek the establishment of such a scheme of policy as will give redress.

Yet the history of petition in the United States teaches that in practice the right is often substantially denied in proportion to the gravity of the emergency. What the men in authority would not dare do directly they have frequently accomplished indirectly. In the long and heated agitation of the slavery question the right of petition was practically refused in numerous instances. In 1836 Congress adopted a resolution declaring that all petitions relative to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia be referred to a special committee, whose duty it should be to report that Congress had no power to interfere with slavery in the States and ought not to do so in the District of Columbia. This committee duly performed the work set for it to do, and recommended that all such petitions be laid on the table without reference or debate. In 1837 the resolution was substantially renewed and a stronger one was passed in 1839. Great excitement was occasioned throughout the country, and demands were made upon Congress to recede from its position. These were responded to by an explanatory resolution of the House of Representatives, declaring that Congress had no power to abolish slavery in the States and affirming that the petitions were a part of a scheme to induce Congress to do away with the traffic in slaves between the States and with the institution itself in the District and the Territories, and so to threaten and really undermine slavery in the States, and thus cause Congress to perform indirectly what it could not do directly. In consequence of this declaration and affirmation the resolution provided that all such petitions should be tabled without being read, printed, referred or debated. Subsequently Congress went a step farther and decreed that none of the petitions in question should be received or noticed in any manner. To the foreign reader it may seem astonishing if not incredible that such a decision could be arrived at by the national Legislature under our free Government; but it was indicated and made inevitable by the logic of events.

In dealing with the petitions for relief from the liquor curse, Congress and most of the State Legislatures have exhibited scarcely less hostility and contempt. Prohibitory legislation of every kind has been petitioned for by many thousands of citizens. For many years petitions of no other class, relating to public policy, have been received at Washington in such numbers and with such constancy as those calling for the passage of temperance bills. The merits of these measures have been rehearsed innumerable times in admirable and forceful language by representatives of the petitioners before committees of Congress. But the policy of both Houses has been not to inquire candidly into the subjects presented by the petitioners or to ascertain the desires of the people at large, but to suppress debate and prevent votes. This policy has had remarkable development in the House of Representatives, where for four successive years the special Alcoholic Liquor Traffic Committee was organized for the express purpose of destroying every temperance bill and shielding the House from the possibility of a formal report upon or an honest discussion of the measures advocated by the multitudes of earnest petitioners.

George C. Christian.

Under a despotic government the right of petition is a boon to be contended for perseveringly and to be prized and exercised freely when secured. But in the United States, so far as it is used to achieve political ends, it is used too much. It is the weakest of weapons. The right of political organization and operation takes its place. When the supporters of a public measure stand together in political action their representatives will carry out their will without the spur of a petition. The man who signs a petition for Prohibitory law too often thinks that his duty ends with petitioning. He is foolish enough to believe that his name attached to a petition has a force equivalent to that of a ballot in favor of the same measure, forgetting that one demand at the ballot-box is more powerful and produces greater results than a dozen requests to a faithless or an indifferent servant in legislative halls, and that it is much easier and infinitely more logical to elect a friend than to influence an enemy when once the latter is secure in public place and owes his place to opposition votes.

It is not claimed, however, that petition is at all times and under all circumstances useless. In matters of minor importance, such as the laying out of a road, the building of an asylum, the chartering of a bank or the promotion of any object that is not conspicuously or profoundly agitated, petition may sometimes be productive of good by acquainting a body like a County Board or even a State Legislature with the subject under consideration and the wishes of the people concerning it. Indeed, we may go far enough to say that in the beginning of a great reform, as a means of agitation and as one of the methods adopted to arrest public attention and secure an expression of individual opinion, the time spent in circulating petitions and obtaining signatures is not entirely lost. A kind of passive support from influential citizens may thus be won. Petitions to licensing boards against the granting of license to particular saloons may also be serviceable and sometimes effective. It may be replied that the object of petition can in such cases be advanced more effectually by utilizing the public press. But the press cannot always be relied on to champion right and truth, and it is not exempt from the corrupting and partisan influences that so frequently determine the course of legislators.

The limitations of petition in the general conflict with the liquor traffic are so many and so serious that it is hardly too much to say that they neutralize, if indeed they do not more than neutralize, the advantages. More than passive support is required to overthrow a gigantic evil, to overcome popular indifference and to change a long-standing public policy. Not by mere petitioning is a great public wrong to be dealt with—a wrong that is intrenched in law, that is sustained by millions of money in these days of "boodle" politics and whose apologists are able to paralyze great historic parties and prevent them from enacting remedial legislation. To substitute the petitions for the ballot, mere personal favor for positive law, an expression of individual sentiment for a peremptory command, is to invite disobedience and contempt. When the evil is well-known and its workings and results are perfectly understood, when the agitation against it has become general and the line of policy has been definitely chosen, then is the time for men to vote rather than to petition, to establish a loyal party rather than to dally with deceitful ones, and to elect friendly officials rather than to humbly beseech neutrals or foes.

T. C. Richmond.

Phillips, Wendell.—The eighth child of John and Sally Walley Phillips; born in Boston, Nov. 29, 1811. His father was the first Mayor of Boston, and among the important offices held by him were those of State Senator and Judge of the Court of Common Pleas. His family was conspicuous for wealth, refinement and social position. Wendell graduated from Harvard College, ranking among the first in his class, at the age of 20, and from the Harvard Law School in 1834, when he was admitted to practice at the Suffolk County bar. Rich, highly educated, endowed with brilliant talents, an Apollo in face and figure, and a member of one of the most aristocratic and influential families, he was the idol of a patrician circle and might have aspired to any position in the gift of the nation. But at the age of 24 he became convinced of the righteousness of the Anti-Slavery cause and cast his lot with the Abolitionists, led by William Lloyd Garrison, who was then publishing the *Liberator*. In November, 1837, he made his début as an Anti-Slavery advocate in Faneuil Hall, at a public meeting called by Dr. Channing and others to consider the assassination of Rev. Elijah Lovejoy at Alton, Ill., by the slaveocracy of that city. Never before had the old "Cradle of Liberty" echoed to such strains of eloquence, and Mr. Phillips's first important public speech placed him among the foremost and most popular of orators. He left the hall amid ringing applause, all opposition to his sentiments for the moment forgotten in the spell he had cast over his audience—and he left it with the door of every worldly advancement closed against him. The aristocracy ostracized him, and he was made to feel that he had offended public sentiment past forgiveness—for at that early day the cause of the slave was despised, and Abolitionism was intensely unpopular. In October, 1837, he married Ann Terry Greene, who, like himself, was well-born, well-reared and wealthy, and although Mrs. Phillips was an invalid theirs was an ideal union. She had converted him to the cause of Anti-Slavery, and throughout his life he always spoke of her as his counsellor, his guide and inspiration. Through obloquy and misrepresentation, defamed by mean men in his own native city, hounded by the press, mobbed by intolerant opponents, denounced by the pulpit and the politicians equally, for 40 years he stood unflinchingly as the friend of the black race and worked for its emancipation till the war accomplished it.

When the war ended and the army was mustered out, Wendell Phillips said the last orders were, "Close the ranks and go forward to new reforms!" He was the first to obey. He had allied himself long before with organizations that were working for Woman Suffrage, labor reform and temperance, and had frequently made addresses in their interest. For he was as conscientiously devoted to these causes as to Anti-Slavery, but Anti-Slavery had the field before the others. In September, 1870, he was nominated for Governor of Massachusetts by the Labor Reform and the Prohibition parties. In his letter of acceptance to the latter he defined his position as follows:

> "As temperance men you were bound to quit the Republican party, since it has deceived you more than once. Any Prohibitionist who adheres to it proclaims beforehand his willingness to be cheated, and so far as political action is concerned betrays his principles. The Republican party deserves our gratitude. It has achieved great results. It will deserve our support whenever it grapples with our present living difficulties. A party must live on present living service, not on laurels, however well earned. . . . The only bulwark against the dangers of intemperance is Prohibition. More than 30 years of experience have convinced me, and as wide an experience has taught you, that this can only be secured by means of a distinct political organization."

This was his position, and he never wavered from it. He attended numerous temperance conventions and was always ready to deliver addresses in favor of Prohibition, lecturing to immense Boston audiences on this subject in Tremont Temple and Music Hall. He argued with great force against license and for a complete closing of the grogshops. He believed alcoholic liquors to be the cause, in great part, of the poverty of the laboring people and of corruption in high places, especially in the government of large cities. One of his most powerful speeches against license was delivered in February, 1880, at the State House in Boston, before a Committee of the Legislature. In the spring of the same year he gave an address concerning the attitude of some of the Boston ministers on the temperance question, which was so caustic that one pitied the offending clergymen. And in January, 1881, Tremont Temple was filled to overflowing when Mr. Phillips reviewed Dr. Howard Crosby's anti-total abstinence discourse. It was in the orator's best vein, brilliant, scathing, merciless, pitiless. "The statute-books in 40 States," said he on this occasion, "are filled with the abortions of thousands of license laws that were never executed, and most of them were never intended to be. . . . License has been tried under the most favorable circumstances and with the best backing for centuries,—10 or 12 at least. . . . We have never been allowed to try Prohibition except in one State and in some small circuits. Wherever it has been tried it has succeeded. Friends who know, claim this; enemies who have been for a dozen years ruining their teeth by biting files, confess it by their lack of argument and lack of facts except when they invent them."

Mr. Phillips died in Boston, Feb. 2, 1884, after a grand life of 72 years. The city of Boston, which had mobbed him and defamed his great name, gave itself up to grief when he was gone, put on mourning for his death, tolled the funeral bells, passed resolutions in his honor, and called for eulogistic orations from eminent citizens. But he would have accounted himself more highly honored by the wreaths that were laid on his coffin by workingmen and by the tears of the poor he had befriended. Sobs broke from the hearts of thousands who came to look their last on the face of him whose life was a ceaseless protest against wrong and injustice, and whose voice was a trumpet-call to be true to the truth though the world stand in arms for the lie. MARY A. LIVERMORE.

Phylloxera. — A genus of insect, classed between plant lice (*aphideæ*) and bark lice (*coccidæ*), and having 16 known species in America and several in Europe; also a name given to a disease of the grape-vine, caused by the ravages of this insect upon its roots. The phylloxera plague first appeared in 1865 in the French vineyards of the lower valley of the Rhône, and it increased in virulence year by year, infecting and destroying hundreds of thousands of acres of the choicest vines in France and spreading to the other wine-producing countries. In 1868 Prof. J. E. Planchon of Montpelier, France, traced the mysterious disease to its true source, the minute insect named by him *phylloxera vastatrix,* which he found at the roots of the disordered vines, consuming and rotting them. Concerning the origin of the pest there is some controversy. In 1870 Prof. C. V. Riley of St. Louis, Mo., announced that he had established the identity of the European root phylloxera with the insect called by Dr. Fitch *pemphigus vitifoliæ,* which makes galls upon the leaves of American grape-vines. Indeed, the opinion that the phylloxera was introduced from America has always been generally accepted; and it seemed to be confirmed by the fact that European viticulturists, experimenting with American vines, found that the phylloxera made its first attacks upon them or in their vicinity. Consequently in the first years of the plague most of the European wine-producing countries, as well as Australia, passed laws prohibiting the importation of American vines. On the other hand some scientists maintain that there is no foundation for the belief in the American origin of the phylloxera. Miret, a French writer, thinks it as likely that the origin was "spontaneous" as that it was American; and Chevalier Rovasendo, the Italian, mournfully observes that "the origin of phylloxera is a question which dominates and is entirely superior to human intelligence." Apart from the question whether America is responsible for the scourge, it is certain that America has contributed the most effectual means of combating it. While some varieties of American vines yield more or less readily to the phylloxera, others, because of their hardiness, resist it successfully. Consequently the vine-growers of Europe replant their wasted lands with American vine-stocks, grafting upon them the European varieties of the grape. But this practice is not a sure preventative, for even the hardy American vines have often been found to succumb to the phylloxera in the course of a few years, while conditions of climate and soil are sometimes unfavorable to the vigorous growth of the transplanted stocks. Various chemical substances (especially bisulphuret of carbon), applied to the roots of the diseased vines, destroy the phylloxera; but treatment with such remedies is costly, must be renewed many times and often kills the plants. The French Government has offered large rewards for the discovery of a thoroughly effectual cure and has assisted the distressed vineyardists in various ways, especially by remitting taxes upon their lands. But it has been impossible to exterminate the pest. In some instances its destructive work has been arrested by the means mentioned, but its devastations are still widespread.

The amount of wealth destroyed by the phylloxera in France is astounding. George W. Roosevelt, United States Consul at Bordeaux in 1888, in a carefully-prepared official communication wrote:

> "From official statistics the surface of vines totally destroyed by this indomitable plague is placed at more than 1,000,000 hectares, with 664,511 hectares of diseased vines, which, estimated at most favorable average, are calculated as an additional 200,000 hectares of dead vines. The actual area of destroyed vines is 1,200,000 hectares, or about one-half of the vineyards of France. (One hectare=2.47 acres.)
>
> "The relative value of the property destroyed is from a national point of view inestimable. To proprietors, and those dependent upon the wine industry as a means of livelihood, the destruction of the vines is incalculable, as the naked ground has but a minimum value, owing to its unsuitable condition to grow other crops. It is generally estimated that a hectare of vines represents a money value equivalent to 6,000 francs. Taking this sum as a basis I find that so far France has sustained a loss of 7,200,000,000 francs (exceeding $1,400,000,000) as a result of vines destroyed. To this may be added loss of private revenue and wages, which latter are difficult to estimate but which may to a certain extent be determined by the amount of foreign wines and dried grapes annually imported into France for the sole purpose of supplying the deficit in the home yield. Below is a tabulated statement of values of wines and dried grapes imported into France from 1875 to 1887, inclusive:

YEARS.	ORDINARY WINES.	DRIED GRAPES.
	Francs.	*Francs.*
1875............	8,351,741	5,755,614
1876............	18,408,811	5,447,204
1877............	22,593,989	8,649,482
1878............	50,204,145	14,829.096
1879............	107,479,899	40,807,043
1880............	297,917,248	62,631,970
1881............	346,516,425	87,364,289
1882............	295,207,947	31,903.088
1883............	360,000,000	39,000,000
1884............	319,664,326	49,644,909
1885............	361,476,779	95,350,824
1886............	489,985,194	88,422,465
1887............	545,000,000	98,000,000
Totals.......	3,222,806,504	577,805,984

> "It will be seen by the above that 3,800,612,488 francs have been expended for foreign wines and dried grapes, which, added to the 7,200,000,000 francs reckoned as values of vines totally destroyed, shows an approximate loss of more than 10,000,000,000 francs (about $2,000,000,000) as a consequence of the phylloxera, which has also been one of the principal causes of the stringency in agricultural, industrial and commercial affairs during the past few years."[1]

Amazing as these figures are, they do not reveal the full significance of the facts. It is necessary to examine in detail the results of the phylloxera's ravages in order to make satisfactory deductions. Each particular wine of France is produced from a particular variety of grape, whose cultivation is confined to a particular district. Bordeaux or claret is obtained in the Médoc district, champagne in the Marne, etc. French statistics show to what extent the phylloxera has destroyed the vines of each district, and much instructive information can be derived from a study of separate returns. Scarcely any district has been free from the phylloxera. One by one they have been wasted by the terrible insect. Up to 1890 the champagne vineyards had wholly escaped, but in that year the phylloxera appeared and it was admitted that all the champagne vines, covering 35,000 acres and yielding 10,000,000 gallons annually, were doomed, and that the supply of this wine would, for the immediate future at least, be very small. It will be interesting to note whether the American importations of French champagnes will, in the next few years, be in ratio to the continuing demand or to the exhausted supply.

---

[1] United States Consular Reports, July, 1889 (pp. 65–70).

The history of the phylloxera's work in the cognac brandy district is typical. Cognac brandy is distilled from the wine of the departments of Charente and Charente-Inférieure, and adjacent islands. The town of Cognac is the commercial center of this district. In the United States Consular reports for January, 1889 (pp. 145–9), was printed a report from Oscar Malmroc, Consul at Cognac, in which the effects of the phylloxera scourge upon brandy production were thoroughly presented. The table below shows (1) the number of gallons of wine produced, respectively, in the Charente and the Charente-Inférieure for each year from 1877 to 1887, inclusive; and (2) the number of gallons of cognac brandy that would have been produced if the entire wine-yield had been turned into brandy. The official figures of wine production are given in hectoliters in Consul Malmroc's report, and the quantities below are calculated on the basis of 26.417 United States gallons to the hectoliter. The "equivalents in brandy" are obtained by accepting Consul Malmroc's estimate that 8½ hectoliters of the wine are required to produce one hectoliter of brandy.

YEARS.	WINE PRODUCED.		EQUIVALENTS IN BRANDY.	
	Charente.	Charente-Inférieure.	Charente.	Charente-Inférieure.
	Galls.	*Galls.*	*Galls.*	*Galls.*
1877	94,267,057	131,578,824	11.090,242	15,479,861
1878	54,273,991	122,356,966	6,385,175	14,394,937
1879	14,506,684	34,547,307	1,706,669	4,064.389
1880	22,079,514	49,503,979	2,597,590	5.823,998
1881	15,169,434	45,086,660	1,784,639	5,304,313
1882	6,523,969	31,099,439	767,526	3,658,757
1883	8,093,878	38,618,590	952,221	4,543,364
1884	5,726,941	30,242,684	673,758	3,557,963
1885	2,976,932	16,091,968	350,227	1,893,173
1886	1,992,159	18,460,252	234,372	2,171,794
1887	1,869,505	15,897,064	219,942	1,870,243

In the five years 1872–6 there were 412,863,632 gallons of wine made in the Charente and 687,499,915 gallons of wine in the Charente-Inférieure; yearly average, 220,072,709 gallons of wine for the two departments. Equivalents in brandy (if the entire wine product were distilled into brandy), for the five years, 48,572,192 gallons in the Charente and 80,882,343 gallons in the Charente-Inférieure; yearly average, 25,890,907 gallons of brandy for the two departments. By comparing these yearly averages with the ones for 1887, it will be seen that the maximum quantity of wine available for cognac brandy (supposing every gallon produced in the two Charentes was available) has been reduced 92 per cent. in the dozen years during which the ravages of the phylloxera were most serious in the two Charentes.

The above estimates of "equivalents in brandy" are, however, misleading. The best cognac brandy, properly so-called, comes (or came) chiefly from that division of the Charente known as the Grand Champagne. A large part of the wine product in other divisions of the Charente and in some portions of the Charente-Inférieure was also used for making cognac; but a very considerable part has always been deemed unfit for distillation into export cognac, and has been used for the manufacture of spirits to be employed in adulteration, while another considerable part has been sent to the north of France and to Holland for consumption among drinkers of unexacting tastes. Singularly enough, the phylloxera's fiercest attacks were made upon the vines which produced the genuine cognac wine, and these vines were almost completely destroyed. Undoubtedly the largest part of the crops of 1882–7 was unsuitable for the manufacture of cognac brandy. From these facts it will be readily believed that for quite a number of years past honest French brandy has been one of the very scarcest articles of commerce, in proportion to the demand.

Yet Consul Malmroc declares that "during the period 1886–8 an average shipment per year of cognac brandy was made of [only] one-half less than the average yearly shipment of the ante-phylloxera period," and that "*the consumption of cognac brandy in France during the last 10 years has not diminished.*" The imports of French brandy into the United States have not materially changed in the last decade. Previously to 1884 the United States statistics did not classify brandy imports separately, but included them under the general head of "spirits and cordials." The total imports of spirits and cordials from France for the four years 1880–3, with values, were: 1880—398,246 proof gallons, valued at $1,108,072; 1881—370,793 proof gallons, valued at $1,082,838; 1882 — 442,993 proof gallons, valued at $1,303,415; 1883—424,903 proof gallons, valued at $1,319,721. For the years 1884–9 the quantities and values of "brandy" imported from France were:

Years Ending June 30.	Proof Gallons.	Values.
1884.	452,570	$1,131.874
1885.	462,216	1,128,710
1886.	388,440	1,019,630
1887.	364,612	972,726
1888.	379,605	1,035,278
1889.	357,658	977,318

Thus in 1889 our imports of French "brandy" lacked only about 40,000 gallons of being equivalent to the whole imports of French spirits and cordials in 1880. In 1880 the effects of the phylloxera's devastations upon commerce in genuine French brandy had only begun to be felt; for honest brandy is not marketable until two or three years after its production. Therefore the imports into the United States in 1880 may possibly be regarded as imports, for the most part, of tolerably pure French brandy. But what is to be said of the imports for the succeeding nine years? While the maximum production of cognac decreased at least 92 per cent., the American supply of French brandy does not seem to have been diminished. And the article apparently was no costlier in 1889 than in 1880. These remarkable figures can be explained only by the conclusion that the American public has been drinking each year some 375,000 gallons, or upwards of 25,000,000 drams, of vilely adulterated French spirits in the guise of so-called brandy.

If it could be ascertained how much potato and beet spirits has been imported into the cognac district in the last decade, and to what extent the traffic in subtile chemical substances (such as are employed by the more clever than scrupulous liquor-makers in the United States) has been augmented there, a partial explanation of the continuance of a heavy trade in cognac brandy after the practical disappearance of cognac brandy might be obtained.

The great lesson taught by the long-continued phylloxera plague is that the wine of commerce, the drink that is supposed to be both innocent and grateful, can no longer by any possibility be even relatively pure. Even before the phylloxera was known most of the wine on the market was regarded with grave suspicion, and extensive vineyards in certain localities were destroyed, or the vintages repeatedly failed, on account of the injury done by the oidium, mildew, black-rot and other vine-pests and diseases. Since the phylloxera began its operations the demand for wine has gone on increasing. With a vastly diminished supply, it has of course been impossible to meet this demand without resorting to extensive adulterations. For the vineyard, the still and the laboratory have been substituted. France, which imported only 3,344,656 gallons of wine in 1870, imported 290,874,813 gallons in 1886. (See p. 132.) This immense quantity of wine now imported into France is chiefly cheap Spanish, Portuguese and Algerian stuff, used for adulterating the French articles. Meanwhile France's importations of distilled spirits have increased three-fold and her exportations of spirits have decreased nearly 40 per cent. (see p. 132), indicating that not only cheap wine but also raw alcohol has been used on a great scale to swell the volume of her own wine product. In order that the former superior qualities of flavor might not suffer from all this blending and fortifying, the skill of the chemist has been in request, and the most harmful drugs have been employed for "doctoring" the French brands. The phylloxera has not promoted temperance, but it has provided a very weighty reason for the discontinuance of wine-drinking: it has demonstrated beyond dispute that no one but an expert can now venture to drink of the decoctions labelled "wine" with any assurance that the article consumed is not highly and poisonously adulterated.

Though the most destructive attacks of the phylloxera have been made in France, there is hardly a wine-producing country where its inroads have not been seriously felt. Official reports up to the beginning of 1888 showed that some 200,000 acres of vineyards had been devastated in Spain; that there were 335,000 acres of infected vines in Portugal, nearly one-half of all the vines in that kingdom having been diseased; that in Italy 211,000 acres of vines had been attacked by the phylloxera; that in Hungary 190,000 acres had been infected, the vines having been totally destroyed throughout nearly one-half of this area; that in Russia the districts of Odessa, Bessarabia, Crimea and Caucasus were under infection in 1888, and that fresh attacks of the phylloxera were being made yearly in Germany, Switzerland and other countries.[1]

Physical Training.—Our leading American institutions of learning have expended hundreds of thousands of dollars upon their gymnasia, and these outlays have been sanctioned by men who may rightfully claim to rank with the wisest of the nation—the college presidents and professors. These provisions for physical training have been made because it has been found that the youth can do better work, both mental and physical, if the body is properly developed. Due consideration of the significance and the results of this acceptance of the physical education idea in our colleges will go far toward removing the impression that the tendency of athletic culture is essentially to promote prize-fighting, brutality, a low moral standard, betting and kindred evils. However serious may be the abuses coming from perversions of individual physical superiority, it is a fact that the systematic and judicious prosecution of physical training is for the welfare of the race, and that its really representative and truly scientific promoters are among the most uncompromising and most important advocates and exemplars of good personal habits and practices as opposed to bad. No persons are better qualified to testify concerning the nature and effects of alcohol, and none, as a class, are more emphatic in condemning drink as an unqualifiedly worthless and injurious thing or in declaring that total abstinence is not merely a virtue but an advantage.

Exercise has been erroneously associated with the development of the voluntary muscular system only. But all the organs of the body, including the brain, share in the improvement that gymnastics gives to the voluntary muscles. The heart especially is stimulated during exercise because of the added work it must do to assist in the metamorphosis of tissue. This work—provided it is not over-work—strengthens the heart and keeps it in excellent condition. Deficient exercise leads to fatty degeneration and weakness, but over-exertion causes valvular trouble, palpitation and hypertrophy while straining and thus weakening the blood-vessels. The "whiskey heart" betrays fatty and fibrous degeneration, a direct result of the use of alcohol. One of the most valuable effects of muscular exercise is that produced on the lungs. The pulmonary circulation is quickened, while the amount of air inspired and of carbon dioxide exhaled is greatly increased. This is in accordance with a law of nature and indicates a healthy condition. Excessive exercise is dangerous for these organs, but moderate action, systematically planned, is necessary in order that the blood may be purified and the carbon may be eliminated from the body. Another point: if the loss of carbon from the lungs be great there must be a sufficient supply of such food as contains this element to repair the waste. It has been noticed that men in training will choose the fats rather than the starchy foods, thus easily and naturally preserving the equilibrium of the body or system. "Alcohol," says Parkes, "lessens the excretion of pulmonary carbon dioxide. It is hurtful during exercise, and it is perhaps for this reason, as well as from the deadening action on the nerves of volition, that those who take alcohol are incapable of great exertion." Indeed, it is now well understood that alcohol is not given by good trainers, and that even its external application is not sanctioned.

Exercise increases the healthy action of the organs of digestion and assimilation, while alcohol checks it and produces chronic catarrhal conditions. Habitual exercise causes appetite; habitual indulgence in alcohol lessens appetite. A healthy appetite calls for healthful food and thus the blood is enriched; an appetite that depends on alcohol is depraved and requires a like food—consequently the result is poor blood, watery, and weak in reconstructive elements. We have seen that the heart and lungs made strong by gymnastics do good work. Especially is this the case if they have blood rich in quality to work with. A very important result of physical training is the building up of the entire body; but if alcohol is habitually used the whole system suffers.

---

[1] Report from James H. Smith of the United States Commercial Agency at Mayence, Germany; United States Consular Reports for June, 1890, pp. 304-6.

Through the blood the body is warmed. Exercise is nature's method of maintaining an even temperature. On a cold day notice the stamping of feet, slapping of hands and swinging of arms. It is universally admitted by Arctic explorers that alcohol does not produce heat but that on the contrary it is harmful, and that muscular exertion or exercise is of far greater value than alcoholic beverages. Dr. Hayes not only refused to use such beverages but also declined to engage men who were in the habit of drinking.

One more comparison. Gymnastics developes not only the muscular system but through it the nerves and brain. Many eminent physiologists agree that the gray matter in the brain is developed by this training, and that exercise is, to a certain extent, the promoter of the highest kind of will-power—that of self-control. The damaging effect of alcohol on the brain and mind is only too well known. The tremor of the body of the drinking man, the varying mental power, the recurring irritability and lack of self-control, the delirium, indicate shattered nerves. Not only does the man himself show the demoralizing effects of drink but his children are likely to be epileptic, idiotic or "odd." On the other hand a man can so develop his muscular and nervous system that, balanced on his head with feet in air and arms extended, he can swing on a small trapeze many feet from the ground.

Briefly, the following important truths lie close to all the fundamental laws established by practical experiments in physical training:

1.—The continued and excessive use of alcohol is destructive to mind and body, or, as Dickinson says, alcohol is the very "genius of degeneration."

2.—The result of temperance and abstinence is to ward off destruction and misery, and to restore health, vigor and happiness to those who have lost these things through indulgence. Thus the influence exercised is both preventive and curative.

3.—The effects of exercise and alcohol are antagonistic. Alcohol destroys, exercise builds up. Weakness, destruction, misery and death spring from alcohol; growth, happiness and health are the results of exercise. The work done by exercise is prophylactic and remedial; that done by alcohol is the reverse. The best physical condition is purity of mind and body; this is ministered to equally by exercise and temperance.

The principles of temperance are taught to children. The principles of physical training should be taught as well. With a healthy body is likely to go a healthy mind, capable of finer perceptions and clearer judgment. Who would knowingly wreck a fine physical organization, fully developed, on the shoals of vice? Let the good Christian worker and the conscientious educator inspire inexperienced youth to cultivate all the attractions that come from health and strength, and the danger from the false allurements of intemperance will be greatly reduced.

William G. Anderson.

Pierpont, John.—Born in Litchfield, Conn, April 6, 1785; died in Medford, Mass., Aug. 27, 1866. He entered Yale College at the age of 15, graduating in 1804. For a short time he was assistant in an academy at Bethlehem, Conn., and in the fall of 1805 he became private tutor in the family of Col. William Allston of South Carolina. Returning to the North in 1809 he began the study of law. In 1812 he was admitted to the bar and commenced practice in Newburyport, Mass., but he soon gave up the profession on account of ill-health and engaged in business as a merchant, first in Boston and later in Baltimore. In the latter city, in 1816, he issued a volume of poems, "Airs of Palestine." About the same time he undertook the study of theology, finishing his course at the Cambridge Divinity School. In April, 1819, he was ordained pastor of the Hollis street (Unitarian) Church, Boston, of which he retained charge until 1845, although in 1835-6 he was absent on an extended tour in Europe and Asia Minor. Before his visit to Europe his radical temperance views, freely expressed, had occasioned considerable feeling on the part of some members of his congregation who were engaged in the liquor traffic, and after his return, in 1838, this prejudice took the form first of controversy and afterward of charges against him. He sustained himself against his enemies for seven years and then requested a dismissal from his church. He was pastor of the Unitarian Church of Troy, N. Y., from 1845 to 1849, and during the succeeding seven years was in charge of the Congregational Church at Medford, Mass., resigning April 6, 1856. He was a candidate of the Liberal party for Governor of Massachusetts, and in 1850 he was nominated for Congress by the Free-soilers. A zealous advocate both of Abolition principles and the temperance reform, he wrote able articles and numerous verses in support of these causes. He was the author of the familiar lines:

"We have a weapon firmer set
And better than the bayonet—
A weapon that comes down as still
As snowflakes fall upon the sod,
Yet executes a freeman's will
As lightning does the will of God."

The following is from a petition (written by him) to the Massachusetts Legislature:

> "If I be willingly accessory to my brother's death by pistol or cord the law holds me guilty, but guiltless if I mix his death-drink in a cup. The halter is my reward if I bring him his death in a bowl of hemlock; if in a glass of spirits I am rewarded with his purse. Yet who would not rather die, who would not rather see his child die, by hemlock than by rum? The law raises me a gallows if I set fire to my neighbor's house, though not a fowl perish in the flames; but if I throw a torch into his household I may lead his children through a fire more consuming than Moloch's, I may make his whole family a burnt-offering on the altar of Mammon, and the same law holds a shield between me and harm. It has installed me in my office, and it comes in to protect alike the priest, the altar and the god. For the victims it has no sympathies; for them it provides neither ransom nor avenger. But there is an Avenger. While these sacrifices are smoking on their thousand altars through the length and breadth of our land, the Ruler of the nations is bringing upon us the penalties of his laws in the consequence of breaking them."

Pledge.—In all ages pledges have been taken by individuals to emphasize resolution or mark important departures. The Old Testament church was distinguished by its solemn covenants. "They shall vow a vow unto the Lord, and perform it." (Isa. 19:21.) The ordinances of Christianity are little else than practical pledges. Pliny relates that the early disciples were accustomed to meet before daylight, to sing hymns to Christ and "to bind themselves by an oath" to abstain from all wickedness. John Howard, the philanthropist, signed a written pledge to devote himself and all that he possessed to the service of God.

For many years past "the pledge" has been one of the chief agencies of the temperance reformers. Dr. F. R. Lees defines a temperance pledge thus: "(1) The expression of a conviction; (2) The declaration of a purpose; (3) The utterance of a protest; (4) A bond of sympathetic union." Paley, in his "Moral Philosophy," says: "Many a man will abstain rather then break his rule who would not easily be brought to exercise the same mortification from higher motives." True it is that a great many taking the pledge in consequence of momentary sentimental impulse, or even of matured decision, have not the moral strength to adhere to it, but relapse into excess more or less speedily. But large numbers, constituting not an inconsiderable proportion of all the pledge-signers, are saved, are permanently reclaimed, often by the force of that pride or sheer tenacity to which Paley alludes, but not infrequently from the very highest of motives. The benefits that the pledge has bestowed upon individuals and families are inestimable. It is the instrumentality to which the world owes the rescue and great services of some of the most famous temperance agitators. It was the basis of all the early temperance societies and the great crusades conducted by Father Mathew, the Washingtonians and others. To-day, although efforts for the suppression of the traffic have largely replaced primitive methods, the pledge still plays an important part. The different temperance organizations require their members to subscribe to it and the moral suasion orators at their numerous meetings obtain many thousands of signatures to it. But the pledge is now regarded as simply a preparatory measure, whose introduction, on however great a scale, is a means and not an end.

One of the oldest temperance pledges on record was written on the blank leaf of an old Irish Bible by R. Bolton, Broughton, Northamptonshire, April 10, 1637, as follows:

> "From this day forwarde to the ende of my life, I will never pledge any healthe, nor drinke in a whole carouse, in a glass, cup, bowle or other drinking instrument, wheresoever it may be, from whomsoever it come—except the *necessity* doth require it. Not my own most gracious

kinge, nor even the greatest monarch or tyrant upon earthe, nor my dearest friend, nor all the goulde in the world, shall ever enforce me. Not angel from heaven (who I know will not attempt it) shall persuade, nor Satan with all his oulde subtleties, nor all the power of hell itself shall betray me. By this very sinne (for sinne it is, and not a little one) I have more offended and dishonored my glorious Maker than by all other sinne that I am subject untoe, and for this very sinne it is my God hath often been strange untoe me, and for that cause and no other respect have I thus vowed, and I heartily beg my good Father in heaven of his great goodness and infinite mercy in Jesus Christ to assist me in the same, and be so favorable untoe me for what is past."

A simple and comprehensive pledge, appropriate for all classes and countries at the present day, is the following: "I solemnly promise to abstain from the manufacture, sale and use of all alcoholic beverages, and to labor in every honorable way to dissuade the drinker and destroy the dramshop."

Poisons have been defined as substances which, when administered in small quantities, are capable of producing deleterious or deadly effects upon the animal organism. The study of those effects is the main key to the problem of temperance.

Under the three heads of Irritants, Narcotics and Narcotico-Irritants chemists have enumerated some 200 different organic and inorganic simples and compounds, all of which, in their action upon the human system, are characterized by the following specific symptoms: To the palate of undepraved human beings all poisons are either repulsive or insipid, yet by their gradual and persistent obtrusion upon the reluctant organism those objects of aversion may beget an unnatural craving for repetitions of the noxious dose, and the persistence and progressiveness of that morbid appetency is proportioned to the virulence of each poison.

1.—*Repulsiveness of Poisons.*—Under normal circumstances the attractiveness of alimentary substances is generally proportioned to the degree of their healthfulness and their nutritive value, while the repulsiveness of poison is with rare exceptions proportioned to the degree of their hurtfulness. Providence has endowed our species with a large share of the self-protective instincts that teach our dumb fellow-creatures to select their proper food. A child's hankering after sweetmeats is only an apparent exception, for, as Dr. Schrodt observes, the conventional diet of our children is so deficient in saccharine elements that instinct constantly prompts them to supply an unsatisfied want. Human beings fed chiefly on fruit-syrups would hanker after farinaceous substances. The savages of our northwestern prairies are as fond of honey as their grizzly neighbors. Sailors in the tropics instinctively thirst after refrigerating fluids, after fruit and fresh vegetables. In the Arctic regions they crave calorific food—oil or fat.

But in no climate of this earth is man afflicted with an instinctive hankering after poison. No human being ever relished the first taste of any stimulant. To the palate of a healthy child tea is insipid, the taste of coffee (unless disguised by milk or sugar) offensively bitter, laudanum acrid-caustic, alcohol as repulsive as corrosive sublimate. No tobacco-smoker ever forgets his horror at the first attempt—the seasick-like misery and headache, expressing nature's protest against the incipience of a health-destroying habit. Of lager beer—"the grateful and nutritious beverage" which our brewers are now prepared to furnish at the rate of 2,000,000 gallons a day,—the first glass is shockingly nauseous, so much so, indeed, as to be a fluid substitute for tartar emetic. Nor do our instincts yield after the first protest: nausea, gripes, nervous headaches and gastric spasms warn us again and again, till the perversion of our inborn tastes at last begets a morbid craving for the repetition of the unnatural process of irritation.

As a singular exception to this general rule physiologists have often mentioned the non-repulsiveness of certain mineral poisons. Arsenious acid (common white arsenic), for instance, does not betray itself by any taste indicating the banefulness of its effects, and it would almost seem as if in the case of such out-of-the-way poisons nature had thought it superfluous to secure the safety of her creatures by the warnings of a protective instinct. But even arsenic, though not violently repulsive, is certainly not attractive, either in taste or odor, while on the other hand a decidedly disagreeable taste is, almost without an exception, an *a priori* argument against the wholesomeness of any mineral or vegetable substance. No creature is misled by an innate craving for unwholesome food, and our natural aversion to nearly all kinds of drastic "medicines" (*i. e.*, virulent stimulants) has already begun to be recognized as a suggestive illustration of that rule.

2.—*Identity of Poisons and Stimulants.*—One effect upon the system of any violent chemical stimulant is strictly that of a poison, and every poison may become a stimulant. There is no bane in the South American swamps, no virulent compound in the North American drug-stores, chemistry knows no deadlier poison, whose gradual and persistent obtrusion upon the human organism will not beget an unnatural craving after a repetition of the baneful dose, a morbid appetency in every way analogous to the hankering of the toper after his favorite tipple. Entirely accidental circumstances, the accessibility of special drugs, imitativeness and the intercourse of commercial nations, the mere whims of fashion, the authority of medical recommendations have often decided the first choice of any special stimulant destined to become a "national beverage" and a national curse. The contemporaries of the Veda writers fuddled with soma-juice, the decoction of a narcotic plant indigenous to the Himalaya foot-hills. Their neighbors, the pastoral Tartars, have for ages got drunk on koumiss, or fermented mare's milk, an abomination which in Eastern Europe threatens to increase the list of imported poisons, while opium is gaining ground in our Pacific States as fast as lager beer, chloral and patent "bitters" are acquiring popularity on the Atlantic slope. The French have added Swiss absinthe to their wines and liquors, the Turks hasheesh and opiates to strong coffee. North America has adopted tea from China, coffee from Arabia (or originally from Ceylon), tobacco from the Caribbean savages, high-wines from France and Spain, and may possibly learn to drink Mexican aloe-sap, or chew the coca-leaves in imitation of the South American Indians. Arsenic has its votaries in the southern Alps. Cinnabar and acetate of copper victimize the miners of the Peruvian sierras. The Ashantees are so fond of sorghum beer that their chieftains have to keep special bamboo cages for the benefit of quarrelsome drunkards. The pastor of a Swiss colony in the Mexican State of Oaxaca told me that the mountaineers of that neighborhood befuddle themselves with cicuta syrup, the inspissated juice of a kind of hemlock that first excites and then depresses the cerebral functions, excessive garrulity being the principal symptom of the exalted stage of intoxication. A decoction of the common fly-toadstool (*agaricus maculatus*) inflames the passions of the Kamtchatka natives and makes them pugnacious, disputative, but eventually splenetic. (Chamino's *Reisen*, p. 322.) The Abyssinians use a fermented preparation of dhurra corn that causes more quarrels than gambling. According to Prof. Vamberry the Syrian Druses pray, though apparently in vain, to be delivered from the temptation of fox-glove tea. Comparative pathology has multiplied these analogies till, in spite of the arguments of a thousand specious advocates, there is no valid reason to doubt that the alleged innate craving for the stimulus of fermented or distilled beverages is wholly abnormal and that the alcohol habit is characterized by all the distinctive symptoms of a poison habit. Chemistry has confirmed that conclusion. "There is no more evidence," says Dr. Parkes, "of alcohol being in any way utilized in the body than there is in regard to ether and chloroform. If alcohol is still to be designated as a *food*, we must extend the meaning of that term so as to make it comprehend not only chloroform but all medicines and poisons—in fact, everything which can be swallowed and absorbed, however foreign it may be to the normal condition of the body and however injurious to its functions. On the other hand, from no definition that can be framed of a *poison*—which should include those more powerful anæsthetic agents whose poisonous character has been unfortunately too clearly manifested in a great number of instances—can alcohol be fairly shut out."

3.—*Progressiveness of the Poison Vice.*—There is a deep significance in that term of our language which describes an unnatural habit as "growing upon" its devotees, for we find, indeed, a striking analogy between the development of the stimulant habit and that of a parasitical plant, which, sprouting from tiny seeds, fastens upon, preys upon and at last strangles its victims. The seductiveness of every stimulant habit gains strength with every new indulgence, and it is a curious fact that that power is proportioned to the original repulsiveness of the poison. The tonic influence of Chinese tea is due to the presence of a stimulating ingredient known as *theïne*, in its concentrated form a strong narcotic poison, but forming only a minute percentage of the component parts of common green tea. On the Pacific coast of our country thousands of Chinese immigrants carry their thrift to the degree of renouncing their favorite beverage; but neither considerations of economy nor of self-preservation will induce the same exiles to break the fetters of the opium habit. Not one hasheesh-eater in a hundred can hope to emancipate himself from the thraldom of his vice, and experience has only too well proved the truth that, while the difficulty of total abstinence has perhaps been overrated, the difficulty of curing the habit of a confirmed alcohol-drinker has been very much underrated. "If a man were sent to hell," says Dr. Rush, "and kept there a thousand years as a punishment for drinking, and then returned, his first cry would be 'Give me rum! Give me rum!'"

And moreover, the alcohol habit grows outward as well as inward. Each gratification of the poison vice is followed by a depressing reaction. But this feeling of exhaustion is progressive, and the correspondingly increased craving for a repetition of the stimulating dose forces its victims either to increase the quantity of the wonted tonic or to resort to a stronger poison. Beer-drinkers advance from small beer to lager beer, wine-drinkers from claret to port and high-wines. The dupes of the "bitters" quack have to swallow his nostrum at shorter and shorter intervals. One radical fallacy identifies the stimulant habit in all its disguises: its victims mistake a process of *irritation* for a process of *invigoration*. The self-deception of the dyspeptic philosopher who hopes to exorcise his blue-devils with the fumes of the same weed that caused his sick-headaches is absolutely analogous to that of the pot-house sot who tries to drown his cares in the source of all his sorrows; and there is no reason to doubt that it is precisely the same fallacy which formerly ascribed remedial virtues to the vilest stimulants of the drug-store, and that with the rarest exceptions the alcoholic poisons administered for "medicinal" purposes have not decreased but considerably increased the sum of human misery. FELIX L. OSWALD.

Political Evils.—Republics are not exempt from serious political evils. Bribery of executive officers and legislators, government by the corrupt, criminal and ignorant classes, wasteful expenditure, intimidation and purchase of voters, disreputable or unscrupulous party leadership, misrepresentation of issues or perversion of facts by a designing press, appeals to prejudice and selfishness, acrimonious discussion, "personalities" and even violence are familiar developments of American politics. It is now frankly admitted by all intelligent persons, even by those who do not favor radical liquor legislation, that broadly viewed, the unwelcome conditions and unwholesome tendencies in our politics and Government have their chief roots in the drink traffic. Drink, said the New York *Tribune*, long after that journal had ceased urging the strong Prohibition policy advocated by its founder, "lies at the centre of all social and political mischief."[1]

Because of the results of the traffic—crime, pauperism, turbulence, vice, murder and the like—it is constantly under police surveillance. If there were no restrictive law on the statute-book the necessity of watching the saloons day and night for violations of law, decency and order would in nowise be diminished: no conditions of laxity on the one hand or restriction on the other have ever been devised by which the character of the dramshop as the principal agent in the production of all the evils known to organized society has been mended. The dramshop proprietor, as well as his customers, may personally desire to do no wrong, but the worst forms of wrong are inevitably nourished by the article dealt in and consumed. Therefore it is not true that the evils complained of, though probably aggravated by license experiments, would be comparatively unimportant if the restrictions on the traffic were removed and the rumseller were treated with the toleration shown to other tradesmen.

---

[1] New York *Tribune*, March 2, 1884.

Thus from the nature of his business the liquor-dealer is in close and permanent contact with the administrative departments of local government. It is not remarkable if a trade against which the law discriminates is diligent in seeking to control the officers of law,—if individuals whose interests depend upon official favor are incessantly employing all the means by which official favor may be cultivated. The pages of history are filled with instances of corrupting and powerful political influence acquired by the unworthiest and most dangerous men and associations of men, whose pursuits have been such as to place them without (or barely within) the pale of the law. There never has existed an association of evil or evil-working men so strong numerically, so wealthy or so firmly established as the association now known as the liquor traffic or "rum power." In the United States more than 500,000 men are engaged in the traffic as proprietors or employes; and counting the adult males who are entirely dependent upon it or whose political action is absolutely subject to barroom dictation, it is hardly possible to estimate the voting strength of the "rum power," in round numbers, at less than 1,400,000, or about 12 per cent. of the aggregate vote of the country. (See pp. 382–5.)

It is characteristic of the liquor vote that it is easily controlled and mobilized. As a class and as individuals the liquor-sellers and their followers care nothing for principles and little for party. Their leaders are quick to determine the merits of each measure of public policy from the pro-liquor point of view, and to decide, in any case, whether their interests make it advisable to unitedly support one party and one candidate in preference to another. They are rarely deceived, and they can count upon the solid support of the "rum vote" with perfect certainty.

Since the temperance question is no longer a merely local issue but has a prominent place in State and national politics, the activity of the liquor element affects State and national as well as municipal affairs. It is of the utmost importance to the traffic that the State Legislatures and Congress which enact laws, and the Governors and Presidents who are vested with veto and appointive powers, shall have friendly or moderate inclinations. The following resolutions, adopted by the New York State Brewers and Maltsters' Association, March 20, 1883, define the political attitude of the "trade" everywhere :

> "RESOLVED, That this Association is an anti-Prohibition Association, pure and simple, and that we do not affiliate with any political party.
>
> "RESOLVED, That all candidates for office, whether for Representatives in Congress, Governors, State Senators or Members of Assembly, shall have a circular addressed to them of the same wording as was sent to candidates in 1882, bearing date Oct. 23.
>
> "RESOLVED, When candidates of both and all parties answer in the affirmative (that is, opposed to Prohibition), each member of this Association shall be at liberty to vote as he deems best. Where they fail to communicate it will be considered as an answer in the negative, in which case we shall withhold our votes or select an independent candidate. When one answers in the affirmative and the other in the negative we shall always support the man who co-operates with us, whatever may be his party." [1]

Probably the gravest political evil for which the saloon is responsible is government by the direct representatives of the saloon. In many cities the traffic, dominating the leading parties, is not content with obedience but insists upon the nomination and election of notorious and unscrupulous liquor-vendors. Thus the offices are filled with the most degraded and barbarous men of the community, men whose livelihood depends essentially upon vice and plunder. "New York, ruled by drunkards," said Wendell Phillips, in 1870, "is proof of the despotism of the dramshop. Men whom murderers serve that they may escape, and because they have escaped the gallows, rule that city. The ribald crew which holds them up could neither stifle its own conscience nor rally its retinue but for the help of the grogshop. A like testimony comes from the history of our other great cities. State laws are defied in their streets; and by means of the dramshop and the gilded saloon of fashionable hotels their ballot-box is in the hands of the criminal classes,—of men who avowedly and systematically defy the laws. Indeed this is the case in Boston."[1]

---

[1] The *Voice*, Sept. 24, 1885.

The relations of the saloon to politics in New York City, the metropolis of the Western hemisphere, deserve more than this passing allusion. They are typical of conditions in scores of other cities and will give a clear idea of the character and results of government by the liquor traffic wherever the traffic is strong or arrogant enough to assume direct responsibility.

The words from Wendell Phillips which we have quoted were written when the famous Tweed Ring was in full control of New York. This organization of thieves, as Mr. Phillips intimates, owed its supremacy to the grogshops and to the criminals who did their bidding. Next to the Tweed episode no other scandal in the political history of New York can be compared with that arising from the disgraceful transactions of the so-called "Boodle" Board of Aldermen of 1884; and of the 24 members of that Board 12 were saloon-keepers or ex-saloon-keepers and 4 were saloon politicians.[2] Indeed, the Board of Aldermen always contains more liquor-dealers than men of any other occupation, and not infrequently the rumsellers have a clear majority in it: at the elections of 1890 11 of the 24 members chosen were saloon-keepers.[3] This is unquestionably the most odious legislative body to be found in the United States: its acts have been so shameful that the State Legislature, with the approval of all good citizens, has deprived it of most of its power.

In 1884 a valuable investigation was conducted by Robert Graham, Secretary of the Church Temperance Society. He located all the nominating conventions and primaries of the Democratic and Republican parties in New York, and found that in a total of 1,002 conventions and primaries of these parties 633 were held in saloons and 96 in places next door to saloons.[4] The political organizations of the city are subservient to the rumsellers. The chief organization is Tammany Hall, and in 1890 a careful analysis of the membership of its General Committee showed that in a total of 4,562 Committeemen 681 were liquor-dealers (of whom 591 were criminal liquor-dealers), while 1,457 members had withheld their names from the City Directory, and manifestly—with perhaps some exceptions—were men of questionable or disreputable character, gamblers, criminals and creatures of the saloon.[5]

The New York City Reform Club is an indefatigable society that has devoted itself to publishing the records of the persons who represent the city in the State Legislature at Albany. Many of these legislators—32 in number—are chosen by dramshop influences and are mere representatives of the saloons. Almost invariably it has been found that those for whom the traffic is peculiarly responsible are unprincipled and unfit men.[6]

New York's experience is illustrative of the situation in every community where the traffic is tolerated. The resulting evils may not always be the same in degree, but they are the same in kind. More serious evils—if possible—are encountered at times. For example, in some of the Western cities—notably Omaha—the licensing of saloons has led to the practical licensing of houses of prostitution. And High License legislation does not in any manner modify the political offensiveness of the traffic. The *Voice*, Sept. 26, 1889, published a formidable table for 33 High License cities (the fees ranging from $500 to $1,000), showing that many liquor-dealers had been chosen to fill important public offices: in Chicago there were nine saloon-keepers in the Board of Aldermen, in Detroit nine, in Omaha four in the City Council, etc. In fact, after making a fair and prolonged trial of all kinds of experiments, Americans have discovered that Prohibition, thoroughly enforced, is the only method by which politics can be purified of the liquor influence.

---

[1] Letter accepting the Prohibition nomination for Governor of Massachusetts, Sept. 4, 1870.

[2] New York City and Its Masters (New York, 1887), by Robert Graham, p. 39.

[3] See the *Voice*, Nov. 20, 1890.

[4] New York City and Its Masters, p. 38.

[5] See the New York *Evening Post*, October, 1890.

[6] The following are significant extracts from the Reform Club's reports:

Charles Smith, proprietor of the "Silver Dollar" saloon and member of the Assembly: "Was interested in a faro bank at 39 Bowery some years ago, and still gambles. Often interests himself in helping 'crooks' of various kinds out of trouble, squaring many a case for sawdust swindlers. His associates are of the lowest. . . . Mr. Smith is probably the worst man in the Assembly. He is the recognized agent on the floor of a well-known lobbyist, and talks carelessly of having money to use for the passage or defeat of this or that measure. . . . Was constantly on the side of the liquor interest, even refusing to be bound by the action of the party caucus in Excise matters. He is the most injurious man to the city in the New York delegation, because of the boldness, pertinacity and constancy of his rascality."

Daniel E. Finn, liquor-dealer and Assemblyman: "He is known to be a dangerous man, and has a record of voting for every bill that had money in it. . . . He is ignorant and corrupt, and all his affiliations are bad. He has served four consecutive terms as Assemblyman, and has made a consistent record as a friend of the liquor interests in politics, an enemy to Civil Service Reform and a disgraceful exponent of the worst influences in New York City politics."

Timothy D. Sullivan, liquor-dealer and Assemblyman. "He has interests in several saloons; one, nominally owned by his brother Jeremiah, at 71 Chrystie street, is connected with a house of prostitution, and is frequented by men and women of the lowest type. He associates with 'toughs' and is ready to use his influence for their protection. In April . . . Inspector Byrnes charged Mr. Sullivan with being an associate of thieves and criminals, specifying among others Peter Barry, one of the leaders of the Whyo Gang, Danny Lyons and Dan Driscoll, hanged for murder. Mr. Byrnes also said of Mr. Sullivan: 'His place (No. 116 Centre street) is well-known locally, and he wanted to advertise to all thieves that it would be a headquarters, a rendezvous for them during the [Constitution] Centennial celebration.'"

Michael Brennan, liquor dealer and Assemblyman: "His character as a legislator has been fully established by four consecutive terms in the Assembly—'85, '86, '87 and '88. It is as bad as he could make it by the unremitting and dishonest industry of these four terms. If the amount of mischief which he has worked seems comparatively small, it must be remembered that his efforts were hampered by ignorance."

(See the *Voice*, Nov. 7, 1889.)

Popular Fallacies.—Logicians tell us that a large plurality of popular fallacies are founded on correct inferences drawn from erroneous premises. More rarely the mistake is due to an error of conclusion, but rarest of all to the double blunder of a wrong proposition climaxed by an unwarranted inference. That egregious class of mistakes is, however, well illustrated in some of the favorite sophisms of the alcohol-worshiper, while in others the erroneousness of the premises is becoming more and more evident even to the unlearned—to all, in fact, but the willfully blind.

1.—"*Moderate Drinking.*"—The advocates of natural hygiene have for years insisted on the possibility of curing the disorders of the human organism by the simple removal of the cause, and the leaders of that reform agree that the objections to the medical use of mineral and vegetable poisons are by no means limited to the momentary influence of virulent drugs. There is always a further and greater danger: the risk of the poison's getting a permanent hold upon the human system and becoming the object of an unnatural appetite, apt to make the patient a life-long slave to the witchery of an abnormal stimulant. The opium habit is only too often contracted in that way; chloral, belladonna and even the intensely bitter sulphate of quinine are known to have become indispensable "tonics." In exactly the same way the habit of using alcoholic liquors is apt to "grow upon" the drinker, as our language so significantly expresses it. For a time—sometimes for weeks—instinctive aversion warns the incipient toper against the folly of toying with the spell of a soul-enslaving poison, but the persistent disregard of that protest at length begins to silence the voice of the inner monitor, and by imperceptible degrees the insidious habit acquires the strength of a dominant passion which at last overcomes the resistance of every better instinct.

That inevitable progressiveness of the alcohol habit can be clearly understood only by an explanation of its physiological cause. The alleged invigorating influence of virulent drugs is, in reality, only a process of irritation. The organism labors with feverish activity to rid itself of a life-endangering poison, and the excitement of that poison fever is by millions of patients mistaken for a symptom of returning strength. They might be undeceived by the distressing reaction which never fails to follow the abnormal excitement, but in a sad plurality of cases the sufferers from that penalty of the stimulant vice will fall into the further mistake of hoping to relieve this distress by a repetition of the poison dose. For a little while that expedient seems to answer its purpose; a second and a third poison-fever goad the weary system into renewed activity, but by and by the jaded nerves fail to respond to the wonted spur, and the dull torpor of the organism can be relieved only by a more and more considerable increase of the dose. The vital energies, as it were, have to be roused from lower and ever lower depths of depression, and that purpose can at last be attained only by an enormous multiple of the quantum of poison which at first produced all the effect of a "bracing and exhilarating stimulant." Hence the well-known phenomenon of the dram-drinker's progress from a glass of light wine to a bottle of strongest brandy, or the lager beer guzzler's advance from an occasional sip to a daily symposium of 12 or 15 bumpers. Hence also the chief fallacy of the advocates of "moderate drinking." Judging from the effects of the first few glasses they foresee no difficulty in controlling their passion: they feel only the cheering warmth of the fire which will soon defy all efforts to quench the conflagration of its devouring flames.

2.—"*Strong Drink for Men.*"—A favorite argument of habitual drinkers is founded upon the idea that men engaged in laborious work need the aid of strong stimulants. "The light domestic labors of women," those philosophers inform us, "can be performed without the stimulus of powerful tonics, and as a consequence women feel no desire for strong drink, except perhaps in Ireland and certain parts of Eastern Europe, where poverty often obliges farm laborers to delegate a share of their hard work to their wives. Boys, too, can and ought to dispense with artificial tonics, but after crossing the threshold of manhood exacting labor will soon beget a craving for sustaining stimulants, and it would be wrong to suppress that instinct." Now, in the first place, there is not a vestige of basis for the assumption that laborious work, mental or physical, requires the stimulus of toxic drugs. Without such aids to cerebral activity the Pythagorean philosophers became the scientific leaders of a science-loving age. Without the aid of fermented or distilled tonics the nations of Islam produced a whole galaxy of inspired poets, of philosophers, statesmen, historians, physicians and naturalists. An equally unwarranted assertion is the oft-repeated statement that experience proves the dependence of physical energy on the sustaining aid of artificial tonics. The most vigorous of our instinct-guided fellow-creatures dispense even with the stimulant of salt. On the scant herbage of the Arctic Circle the reindeer sustains the vital strength that enables it to resist an ice-tornado of 65° below zero, while drawing a heavy-loaded sledge at the rate of eight miles an hour, for 10 or 12 consecutive days. Without "peptic bitters," without allspice or salt, the Indian leopard manages to digest a meal of 20 pounds of raw meat in a sweltering climate. From a purely vegetable and non-stimulating diet the elephant derives the strength that enables him to uproot trees a foot in diameter and hurl down a tiger with force sufficient to break every larger bone in its body. The strictly frugal diet of our next zoological relatives, the orangs, gibbons and gorillas, furnishes them an amount of physical vigor incredibly far exceeding the strength of our lager beer-fuddled athletes. The testimony of numerous Eastern travellers leaves no doubt of the fact that the freight-carriers of Constantinople think nothing of shouldering a burden of 600 pounds and walking off with a firm, even step, like soldiers marching along with light haversacks. Yet poverty, if not religious scruples, obliges those turbaned Samsons to dispense with all "tonic" liquors, and often even with meat and tobacco.

It must be admitted that the stimulant habit in its grosser forms claims about a hundred male victims to one female; but the chief cause of that difference is the retired mode of life incident to the domestic occupations of our mothers and sisters. The temptations of the grog-shop do not exist for a large portion of our female population, and the force of public opinion itself is a potent safeguard of female temperance. In England and North America it has saved women from the tobacco habit as well as from alcoholism, while the social tolerance of the Spanish-American republics has developed millions of girl-smokers. Two hundred years ago, when infants were fuddled with beer-soups, even maids-of-honor confessed to a fondness for a luncheon of ale and beef, and many a Highland lassie pledged her departing lover in a cup of *usquebaugh*. The happiest of all social ostracisms has now banished such practices to the wigwams of the Chippewa Indians, and the total abstinence of thousands of hard-working women in the farming districts of Australia, North America and Western Europe conclusively proves that physical vigor can dispense with the aid of artificial stimulants.

3.—"*Care-Dispelling Wine.*"—Drunkenness has often been defined as an advance-draft on the enjoyment of future years, and men whose tenure of life seemed rather dubious may often have congratulated themselves on the wisdom of thus anticipating their due of pleasure, and, as it were, foreclosing a claim to happiness which coming years might have failed to settle. But in reality the self-delusion of the wine-worshiper is a much more serious mistake. The effect of the first large dose of alcohol is simply that of a poison fever. In its eagerness to rid itself of a life-endangering drug the organism rises in revolt and calls upon all the reserve force of vital energy to participate in the work of expurgation. But a frequent repetition of the poison dose considerably modifies that sensitiveness of the system. It would be a mistake to suppose that the human body could become inured (accommodate itself, as it were) to the effects of alcohol; but every successive poison-fever is followed by a greater and ever greater exhaustion of the nervous system, and the next following dose of the baneful stimulant has therefore to rouse the vital energies from a greater depth of depression. That depression will soon reach a degree when even a large quantum of the most powerful toxic irritant can procure the toper only a few minutes' relief from the dull, soul-sickening misery of alcoholism.

The confirmed toper, in fact, will try in vain to delude himself any longer even with the momentary hope of being able to trick fate out of a surplus of enjoyment. He has sunk beyond the depth of that hope, and even in the crisis of the stimulant fever the momentary return of a factitious elation will fall far short of the spontaneous buoyancy of his childhood years. His lucid intervals are only brief glimpses of the light cheering inhabitants of the brighter world, forfeited by his contrast with the power of darkness. Wine is a mocker, even in its after effects; and the influence of the more concentrated alcoholic poisons has evolved mental types so devoid of the very capacity for enjoyment that their condition might seem to justify the gloomiest inferences of pessimism. Since the introduction of gin and rum many districts of Great Britain would fail to explain the ancient name of "Merry" old England. Life-weary, world-hating and self-despising wretches sneak like specters through the gloom of liquor-reeking slums, where the companions of Robin Hood once followed the chase through the greenwoods; and in the absinthe-hells of the French manufacturing towns Pandora seems to have turned loose all her curses without the compensating blessing of Hope.

> "I seem to feel, wherever I go,
> That there has passed away a glory from this earth,"

says Wordsworth, whose studies of bygone times enabled him to realize the loss of that spontaneous gayety which constituted the chief charm of the golden age of health and nature-worship. Insanity and suicide have never failed to increase with the growth of the alcohol vice; and the best authorities on mental pathology agree that in nine out of ten cases mental derangements supervene as a consequence of afflictions so burdensome as to make oblivion a lesser evil. In other words, the practical evidence of statistics proves the fact that even the total loss of reason is preferable to the misery resulting from the habitual use of liquors which their vendors recommend as soul-cheering and care-dispelling beverages.

4.—*The Revenue Argument.*—In the summer of 1888 the garrison of a German trading-post on the Lower Congo river captured a chieftain who had puzzled the colonists by the persistence of his hostility and whose last raid seemed to have been prompted by a sheer wanton love of havoc. At first he refused to speak, but in the presence of a military commission he at last consented to explain his conduct by the confession that "the importation of salted beef from Port Loando had diminished the demand for man-meat and thus curtailed his revenues." From a financial point of view that argument compares favorably with the logic of the political economists who try to persuade us that the prosperity of our Republic would be imperilled by the abolition of the poison traffic. The Congo chief might have furnished actual proof that his income depended on the encouragement of cannibalism, while even the complete suppression of the manufacture of alcoholic poisons would in no way impair the profits of scores of different industries that have laid the foundations of our national wealth; but moreover it admits of mathematical demonstration that the fiscal emoluments derived from the tax on intoxicating liquors are enormously outweighed by the burdens which the consequences of the alcohol vice entail on the resources of the nation. Alcohol is the chief cause of crime, a principal cause of vice, idiocy and disease, and the main obstacle to the progress of industry and education. War itself has been a less grievous burden to the nations of the Caucasian race than the monster curse of alcohol, and the shortsightedness must approach blindness that can seriously insist on the perpetuation of that curse for the sake of a government share in the profits of the poison-monger. We might as well license a horde of train-wreckers and try to silence the protests of the victims by quoting the endorsements of a bribed revenue committee and flaunting the coined proceeds of the infamous contract. FELIX L. OSWALD.

Port.—See PORTUGAL and VINOUS LIQUORS.

Portugal.—During the 160 years of its union with the Spanish monarchy Portugal was the most drink-cursed country of southern Europe. Political ambition was suppressed, commerce and industry languished and the discontented nobles sought diversion in alcoholic excesses. Wealthy individuals of the middle classes followed their example, and the writers of that period agree in representing the 17th Century as an age of recklessness and intemperance. The national revival following the war of independence, however, inaugurated an era of reform, and since the treaty of Lisbon (1668) habitual intemperance has been discouraged by the example of the transatlantic colonists and the influence of the clergy. "American banquets," *i.e.*, convivial assemblies without the mediæval orgies of intoxication, were at first a topic of popular ribaldry, but became gradually a synonym of decent entertainments; and the humorist Almeida, in his comic dramas, invariably represents drunkards as persons of extravagant hostility to the progress of culture.

In 1851 the Marquis de Saldanha, the Cromwell of Portugal, left the real estate-owning clergy the alternative of confiscation or reform, and specially urged the Cortes to abolish the system of peddling the produce of the convent vineyards at church-festivals and religious pilgrimages. After a bitter and protracted controversy the clerics, in the words of a Portuguese writer, "decided to control a movement which they were unable to suppress," and at first from necessity, but before long from motives of honest conviction, did their best to educate the country population in the temperate habits of the upper classes. The absolute prohibition of the liquor traffic seemed a task too hopeless to attempt ; but much has been done in the way of mitigating the consequences of the evil. Throughout the provinces of Minho and Tras os Montes the sale of wine to minors is strictly interdicted, and the cities of Lisbon, Coimbra, Oporto and Villa Real have abolished the lottery *osterias* — gambling dens where the recklessness of the players was stimulated by a liberal distribution of intoxicating liquors. Drunkenness has been considerably diminished by the municipal regulations of many incorporated towns, as well as by the reform of army discipline, absence without leave, in a state of intoxication, being now punished as desertion in the field and as a gross neglect of duty in times of peace.

FELIX L. OSWALD.

The retail liquor traffic in Portugal is subject to license regulations, and the sale in certain places is carried on under various police restrictions. The wholesale trade is taxed in proportion to the quantity of liquor sold.

The wine interest overshadows all other industries,[1] and next to it, among the manufacturing industries, ranks tobacco manufacture.[2] In this connection it is interesting to note that the condition of the people is lamentable and that they are very low in the scale of intelligence: according to the "Statesman's Year Book" for 1889 82 per cent. of the inhabitants of Portugal and her islands were illiterate. (In this estimate, however, young children were included.) The principal wine is the

---

[1] The state of agriculture in Portugal is still deplorable. The wealth and energy of the country have been thrown into the wine-trade, and the production and cultivation of cereals have been so much neglected that, in spite of its being eminently adapted for such cultivation, nearly all its cereals are imported from the United States, to the value in 1883 of over £1,000,000. The wine production, on which Portugal has so long depended, was the work of the Methuen treaty of 1703, for it was not until after that treaty that the barren rocks of the Alto Douro were covered with vines. But now, though the returns show slight alteration, there must soon be a great change. The phylloxera has utterly destroyed thousands of vineyards in Entre Minho e Douro and in Beira. . . . To remedy the failure, which can be only a matter of time, tobacco-growing has been proposed and will probably be tried in place of vine-culture.—*Encyclopædia Britannica, article on "Portugal."*

[2] Ibid.

Oporto, or port, produced from vines on the Alto Douro, in a region about 150 square miles in area. These and the other vines have suffered fearfully from the ravages of the phylloxera ; indeed official figures show that up to 1887 about half of all the vineyards of the kingdom had been infected. (See p. 481.) Yet the exports of Portuguese wines have increased. The following comparative figures of exports of wines are taken from the United States Consular Reports for 1887, pp. 70–1:

	1875.		1885.	
	Galls.	*Dollars.*	*Galls.*	*Dollars.*
Port	8,566,840	9,770,788	9,189,655	6,534,000
Madeira	221,902	461,592	497,828	723,600
Other Wines	4,619,924	1,792,800	29,610,551	8,792,280
Totals	13.408,666	12,025,180	39,298,034	16,049,880

The total annual wine-yield of the kingdom (if the Portuguese drink may now be considered wine) is from 75,000,000 to 100,000,000 gallons.

Presbyterian Church. — This church was among the first of the religious denominations in the United States to formulate radical temperance utterances. In 1834 it was declared that "as friends of the cause of temperance this [General] Assembly rejoices to lend the force of their example to that cause as an ecclesiastical body by an entire abstinence themselves from the use of ardent spirits," and that "The traffic in ardent spirits, to be used as a drink by any people, is, in our judgment, morally wrong, and ought to be viewed as such by the churches of Jesus Christ universally." As early as 1842 it was proposed to exclude liquor-makers and sellers from the privileges of membership in the church; but this movement was not successful until 1865, when the General Assembly decreed that the church "must purge herself from all participation in the sin by removing from her pale all who are engaged in the manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks for use as a common beverage." The church was in full sympathy with the Prohibitory agitation which followed the enactment of the Maine law. In 1854 the General Assembly expressed the hope that the time was not far distant "when such a law [Prohibition] should be universally adopted and enforced," and in 1855 it declared:

"The experience of 200 years proves that this evil can never be removed or effectively resisted while the traffic in intoxicating liquors is continued, it being necessary, if we would stop the effect, to remove the cause. Laws prohibiting the sale of intoxicating drinks can interfere with the rights of no man, because no man has a right of any name or nature inconsistent with the public good, or at war with the welfare of the community, it being a well-known, universally acknowledged maxim of law that 'no man has a right to use his own to the injury of his neighbor.'"

The utterances of the General Assembly have lost none of their aggressiveness in recent years. In 1889 this body held its sessions in the church of Dr. Howard Crosby, and against the opposition of Dr. Crosby reaffirmed the declaration made in 1883, as follows :

"We earnestly recommend to ministers and congregations in our connection and to all others to persevere in vigorous efforts until laws shall be enacted in every State and Territory of our beloved country prohibiting entirely a traffic which is the principal cause of the drunkenness and its consequent pauperism, crime, taxation, lamentations, war, and ruin to the bodies and souls of men with which the country has so long been afflicted."

The following is a part of the report made by the Standing Committee on Temperance to the General Assembly in 1890, and adopted by the Assembly:

"More and more deeply the conviction has been burning itself into the public mind that however checked by legislative restrictions, or burdened by heavier taxation, the peril of the public sale of intoxicants is too great for any valid excuse of its existence. In regard to such an evil that affects the whole body of our people, the issue is being steadily pressed by conscience and self-preservation against the greed which is now absolutely the only cause for the retention of the dramshop.

"Indeed, the saloon has well-nigh passed the period of its defense. Nobody stands up for it to-day, except as an alleged necessary evil supposed to be so strong as to be incapable of suppression and which must continue, only to be curbed and prevented from venting quite its full curse. It must be the business of the better class of our citizens, and of Christian society at large, to prove that theory false.

"Eventually the open sale of liquor must go. Forces are now at work that, however temporarily resisted, will yet crush the life out of it. . . .

"Besides the principles hitherto stated, and the resolutions offered, we suggest the following action :

"1.—We stand by the deliverances hitherto issued by our Church upon the temperance question, . . . and we enjoin our ministers and people to abate nothing in their zeal and effort in or out of the churches to check the drinking habits of society, and by effort, voice and vote to oppose the traffic in intoxicants as a beverage, believing with intensified conviction that it is a direct inexcusable curse to our country and our age.

"2.—While, as a church, we neither advocate nor antagonize any political party, we earnestly commend to our ministers and people, as Christian citizens, such vigorous, persevering efforts as may seem wisest to them toward the enactment in every State and Territory of statutes which shall hopefully secure entire Prohibition of a traffic largely responsible for the bulk of the drunkenness, crime, pauperism and social miseries which afflict our land. . . ."

Prohibition (General Principles).—Prohibition, the opposite of permission, is not a synonym of annihilation. Those who say "Prohibition does not prohibit"—a self-contradictory proposition—mean that Prohibition does not annihilate. This is manifestly true of all kinds of prohibitions in this world—those of the divine government, of family government and of civil government alike. Prohibition does not annihilate, not even when it forbids murder, adultery, theft, false witness and Sunday work. If a threefold alliance of man, woman and the devil, to break a Prohibitory law and then hide away from justice, proves the law a "blunder," what is to be said of that first prohibition, given to man by God himself, in Eden? If Prohibition is a "failure" when it does not at once destroy the evils which it forbids, then the Prohibitory law of Sinai is the masterpiece of failures.

Prohibition does not define accomplishment, but only the aim and attitude of government toward wrong. License is a purchased truce—sometimes a surrender; Prohibition is a declaration of war. License is an edict of toleration—sometimes a certificate of "good moral character;" Prohibition is a proclamation of outlawry. As murder, adultery, theft, false witness and political corruption are outlawed, the ringleader of this "gang" ought also to be outlawed. The first requisite of law is justice. A law that sanctions wrong is not law at all but legislative crime. It is not "public sentiment" but public conscience out of which law should be quarried. Law is an educator. Duelling and smuggling and liquor-selling were once in the "best society." Gradually the law has made them disreputable. Rumselling in Maine is a sneaking fugitive, like counterfeiting—not dead but disgraced, and so shorn of power.

Prohibition of the liquor traffic is more than a standard or a flag to mark the height to which we are marching. No other kind of prohibition, as I have said, has had greater victories. In Maine children grow up without ever seeing a drunken man. In most parts of Kansas and Iowa the law against the saloon is as effective as the law against the brothel or the burglar. To this fact testify a glorious company of witnesses—Governors, Senators, Congressmen, pastors, physicians, manufacturers—against whose evidence scarcely a witness can be brought in rebuttal except "anonymous." The liquor-dealers have saved us the trouble of summing up this testimony. Their statement that more liquor is consumed under Prohibition than without it is cancelled by actions that speak louder than words, by frantic efforts, at great cost, to defeat Prohibition wherever it is proposed. If while cancelling their license fees it really increased their sales and so gave them double gains, as they are sometimes able to make even Christians believe, they would hardly fight so helpful a friend.

The argument for Prohibition may be concisely stated in four propositions, the four strands of the halter with which the rum traffic is to be hung:

1.—The business interests of our country demand the suppression of their worst foe—the saloon.

2.—The homes of our country demand the suppression of their worst foe—the saloon.

3.—The political liberty of our country demands the suppression of its worst foe—the saloon.

4.—The conscience of the country demands that the attitude of Government toward this foe of business, home and liberty, as toward other foes of the public good, shall be one of uncompromising hostility.

The prohibiting of maddening poison is not a "sumptuary law" that is, a law against luxury—but rather a law to promote luxury, to give every year to the impoverished families of those who waste their money for drink, in place of it, a billion dollars' worth of pianos, books, pictures, etc.

Prohibition is consistent with liberty in the same way as fire-escapes and quarantines are. A Prohibitory liquor law is a law for the promotion of commerce, for the protection of labor, for the prevention of cruelty and crime, for the preservation of health and home and liberty.

The capital that is invested in the liquor business, if invested in legitimate forms of trade, would give employment to hundreds of thousands more people than are now employed by it. This added number of workers would be needed in mills and shops if the money spent for drink were turned into those channels of trade where there is a "fair exchange" and so "no robbery."

Not only life but liberty itself is menaced by alcohol. In the words of the *Catholic Review*, "There is nothing fanciful in the assertion that in most of the large cities the saloon-keeping interest has as much representation in the Common Council as have all other interests combined—that is to say, the minority in numbers, intelligence and decency governs the majority in most of our large cities." It is this "spoils system" of the saloons that Civil Service Reformers should strike at if they would cure political corruption at the root. It is not so much examination of office-seekers as extermination of these office-brokers of the saloon that is needed. Municipal reformers also should learn that it is not by a change in the Mayor's office but by a change in the saloon that city politics is to be purified. If our city politics is in slavery to the saloons to-day, when the States are able to restrain them by their yeoman majorities in the Legislatures, what of the time when the cities shall have the majority of our voters, as they will only eight Presidential elections from now—the third national campaign in which the babes now in your cradles will vote? In 1920, at the present rate of growth, cities of above 8,000 inhabitants will have a clear majority of the voters of the country. The peril is not even so far off as that, for the cities have to-day a power out of proportion to their numbers as compared with country districts, because their forces are more concentrated and better organized. And besides this, the saloon has carried city corruption into the country, except where Local Option or some other form of Prohibition has barred the way. "Ireland sober is Ireland free." So we may say of our own country: America's liquor or its liberty must go.

There is reason to believe that alcohol may be not only universally prohibited in our country but also annihilated. The *Journal of Chemistry* has shown that the dangerous exceptions made for its use in medicine and the arts are unnecessary, since science has safer substitutes (see "The Temperance Century" p. 87). It is also to be remembered that the passion for alcohol is not a natural passion like sexuality, but wholly artificial, making it an evil like slavery that may be wholly obliterated. It may not be wise to prohibit any but the beverage use of alcohol until a generation of physicians, intelligent enough to doctor without this dynamite, has been raised, but the goal which we should set before us should be, after Prohibition, annihilation.

WILBUR F. CRAFTS.

A most observable fact in the temperance reform has been its constantly widening range. It started in individual action, but passed almost immediately into various kinds of association for mutual aid. Indeed, this transition may be looked on as the first step in temperance as a reform. From a guarded use of intoxicants, pressed by the exigencies of the case, it moved forward to their absolute rejection. In a similar way it was forced beyond individual abstinence into civic Prohibition. From Prohibition in towns and counties it advanced to Constitutional Prohibition in the State, and from this it is advancing to Prohibition by the general Government. Each of these steps has been taken because of the necessary widening of the conflict and the need for more resources in meeting it.

Some may look upon this constant increase of demands as evidence of the impossibility and futility of the entire movement. The believers in Prohibition regard it as the inevitable result of the breadth and unity of those social relations which enclose us. We cannot win our own without seeking like gifts for all. Each step of extension makes the previous position more secure. We are compelled to conquer a boundary or lose what we have already gained, and that boundary is the world. A nation doubtless offers a fairly defensible unit in this strife, and yet the moment we achieve this success we shall become increasingly sensible of an outside pressure from other nations opposed to us in sentiment and action. International co-operation is necessary to make Prohibition effectual. This was recognized by the Powers bordering on the North Sea, when, perceiving the dire consequences of intemperance among the fishermen in those waters, they joined in promulgating the celebrated Prohibitory agreement of 1887.[1] The absolute and sweeping Prohibitory law for the Samoan Islands, against alcoholic beverages of all kinds, incorporated in the treaty for the government of those islands drawn up in Berlin in 1889 by the plenipotentiaries of the United States, Great Britain and Germany (and subsequently ratified by the three Powers), is another instructive instance.[2]

The most constant and obviously influential activity which unites us to other countries is that of commerce. Commerce is a chief medium to the better as well as to the worst influences that lie between different peoples and races. Notably, three forms of trade—that in slaves, that in opium and that in rum—have carried with them the most terrible evils and drawn out the most brutish and diabolical passions. The results of traffic at war with all sense of right have been the more disastrous and more considerable because it has been carried on between the weak and the strong, the ignorant and the enlightened, unchristian and Christian nations. It has had no other motive than the unscrupulous greed of those who had the world in their avaricious grasp. The slave trade has at length come under the censure and partial repression of the Christian world. The trade in rum is in full activity. Less immediate violence attends upon it, but its evils are more pervasive and far less remediable than those of the slave trade. Africa is the dark continent because of the barbarism of so large a part of its inhabitants, because of the slave trade, and still more, just now, because of the sale of those fiery liquors, full of all evil inspiration, of which rum stands the representative. This commerce brings at once the worst vices of civilized life to those who have neither the experience, the interests, the intellectual force nor the moral motives fitting them for resistance. If civilization offers to those under it new temptations it also furnishes them new incentives of self-government; but rum in Africa carries ruin without mitigation or relief of any sort. The black man is debauched immediately and completely by intoxication. For a nation like the United States to suffer such a commerce on the part of its subjects is to impose a collective responsibility on each citizen for a line of action which is simply devilish in every phase of it.

For other Christian nations to permit and to share this commerce—since the principle of common interest and responsibility in defining the connections of the civilized and uncivilized portions of the world to each other has long been recognized, and has just been renewedly applied in adjusting the relation of Africa to outside claims—is to weigh down the moral sense of the world collectively with the worst of crimes. We cannot easily overestimate the moral results of such a fact. International relations rest, for equity and safety, on the collective convictions of men. International law and comity are the slow extension between nations of just and humane principles. The burden most oppressive to the prosperity of the world is that incident to war. As long as force is more significant than right this danger, intolerable as it is, will increase rather than diminish. The civilized world cannot take, as in the Conference at Berlin, the attitude of unhesitating selfishness, indicated by free rum on the Congo, and not feel in all its own relations the disastrous influence of the principle there recognized.[1]

---

[1] The six Powers bordering on the North Sea—viz., Great Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, Germany and Denmark—have come to an international agreement which applies to that part of the North Sea which is outside territorial limits. [Inside territorial waters each country can make its own laws.]

The arrangement is shortly as follows:

The sale of spirits to fishermen and other persons on board fishing-vessels is prohibited.

Fishermen are equally forbidden to buy spirits.

The exchange or barter for spirits of any article, especially the fish caught, nets or any part of the gear or "equipage" of the fishing-boat, is also prohibited.

Vessels which ply on the North Sea for the purpose of selling to fishermen other articles (not spirits) will have to be licensed by the Government of their own country, and to be liable to strict regulations, with the object of insuring their not having spirits on board for sale.

The six countries engage to propose to their respective Legislatures laws to carry this arrangement into effect and to punish those who do not conform to it.—*Political Prohibitionist* for 1888, p. 10.

[2] This treaty was signed June 14, 1889, and its provisions have been promulgated by proclamation by the King of Samoa. The following is the text of the Prohibitory clause:

"No spirituous, vinous or fermented liquors, or intoxicating drinks whatever, shall be sold, given or offered to any native Samoan or South Sea islander resident in Samoa, to be taken as a beverage. Adequate penalties, including imprisonment for the violation of the provisions of this Article, shall be established by the Municipal Council for application within its jurisdiction, and by the Samoan Government for all the islands."

The principle, compactly put, is, that the weak have no protection against the strong. Man, endowed with appetites tenfold more cruel and widely destructive than those of the animal, sinks down to the same basis of rapine. The temper which expresses itself in Asia, Africa and the isles of the sea will confront the nations of Europe in their intercourse with each other and compel them to devote the energies of life to a fearful strain in a limitless effort to outstrip each other in the race of physical force. "How truly terrible and tragic the actual situation of Europe is! Never was there anything similar in preceding centuries. Every one is convinced that at any moment so horrible a war may break out that all other wars, even that of secession in America, will be but child's play in comparison." Seven millions of men, backed by a reserve of ten millions more, stand ready to be precipitated on each other. It is wholly in harmony with the relations of the moral world to assert that this avalanche, ready to fall, may indirectly be brought down by the moral jar attendant on the unscrupulous counsel by which the outlying world of barbarism is subjected to the avarice of the worst agents of civilized life. It is precisely this spirit and no other which these Christian nations have to fear. It is this temper which begets conditions ready, with fatal force, to sweep down and over all justice, all humanity and every divine impulse. More than ten millions of gallons of liquor are annually sent to West Africa, where it is known to work mischief of the most unqualified, speedy and unprovoked kind. Germany, the Netherlands, the United States, France and Great Britain are engaged in the traffic,

---

[1] The action in regard to the African liquor trade taken by the Anti-Slavery Conference at Brussels in 1890 indicates a decided change from the attitude of the Powers at the Berlin Conference of 1884. The Brussels Conference incorporated the following in its general act:

"CHAPTER VI.

"Restrictive Measures Concerning the Traffic in Spirituous Liquors.

"*Article* 90.—Justly anxious about the moral and material consequences which the abuse of spirituous liquors entails on the native populations, the signatory Powers have agreed to apply the provisions of Articles 91, 92 and 93 within a zone extending from the 20° north latitude to the 22° south latitude, and bounded by the Atlantic Ocean on the west and by the Indian Ocean on the east, with its dependencies, comprising the islands adjacent to the mainland, up to 100 sea miles from the shore.

"*Article* 91.—In the districts of this zone where it shall be ascertained that, either on account of religious belief or from other motives, the use of distilled liquors does not exist or has not been developed, the Powers shall prohibit their importation. The manufacture of distilled liquors there shall be equally prohibited.

"Each Power shall determine the limits of the zone of prohibition of alcoholic liquors in its possessions or protectorates, and shall be bound to notify the limits thereof to the other Powers within the space of six months. The above prohibition can only be suspended in the case of limited quantities destined for the consumption of the non-native population and imported under the régime and conditions determined by each Government.

"*Article* 92.—The Powers having possessions or exercising protectorates in the regions of the zone which are not placed under the action of the prohibition, and into which alcoholic liquors are at present either freely imported or pay an import duty of less than 15 francs per hectoliter at 50° centigrade, undertake to levy on these alcoholic liquors an import duty of 15 francs per hectoliter at 50° centigrade for three years after the present general act comes into force. At the expiration of this period the duty may be increased to 25 francs during a fresh period of three years. At the end of the sixth year it shall be submitted to revision, taking as a basis the average results produced by these tariffs, for the purpose of then fixing, if possible, a minimum duty throughout the whole extent of the zone where the prohibition referred to in Article 91 is not in force.

"The Powers have the right of maintaining and increasing the duties beyond the minimum fixed by the present Article in those regions where they already possess that right.

"*Article* 93.—The distilled liquors manufactured in the regions referred to in Article 92 and intended for inland consumption, shall be subject to an Excise duty.

"This Excise duty, the collection of which the Powers undertake to insure as far as possible, shall not be lower than the minimum import duty fixed by Article 92.

"*Article* 94.—Signatory-Powers having in Africa possessions contiguous to the zone specified in Article 90 undertake to adopt the necessary measures for preventing the introduction of spirituous liquors within the territories of the said zone by their inland frontiers.

"*Article* 95.—The Powers shall communicate to each other, through the office at Brussels, and according to the terms of Chapter V., information relating to the traffic in alcoholic liquors within their respective territories."

The object of these provisions is, briefly, to prevent the extension of the liquor traffic in Africa. The zone referred to includes the Soudan, Guinea, Ashantee, Senegambia, Liberia, Dafur, Abyssinia, Somali, the Congo Free State, the great lakes, the Zanzibar coast, Angola, Benguela, Damaraland, Mozambique, most of Madagascar and vast regions of the unexplored territory of central Africa. The prohibition does not contemplate the abandonment of the present destructive rum traffic in many portions of this great domain, and the provisions made are therefore seriously defective. But a progressive spirit is indicated, and if the legislation of the Conference is approved and goes into effect and is enforced, the corruption of many millions of the natives of Africa will be prevented. Especial credit has been given to England and the United States for the adoption of these provisions.

At the time that this is written (December, 1890) it is uncertain whether the Brussels legislation will take effect. To be valid it must be endorsed by the Governments of the Powers represented in the Conference (England, France, Germany, Holland, the United States, Portugal, Austria-Hungary, Denmark, Spain, the Congo Free State, Italy, Persia, Russia, Sweden–Norway and Turkey). Holland has manifested a strong disposition to repudiate it, because the customs duties on certain articles, as determined in the general act, are regarded with disfavor by Hollandish merchants.

Germany well in the lead. It is as impossible that such clear, self-conscious international sin should not help to break down international morality as it is that drunkenness should not penetrate and overthrow intellectual and spiritual power.

International law has gained a footing among the nations of Europe largely because they profess one religious faith. This victory of reason and righteousness must owe its completion, if it is to be completed, to a purified moral sense. Such an institution as the slave trade checked progress everywhere because it depressed the standard of duty under which that advance was to be made. The traffic in rum to-day takes its place in its wide-reaching and malign influence. It constitutes the present dark spot in the history of a dark world. The world brings to Christian nations, seeking their own development, one after another of the practical problems of duty, and each for the moment becomes the turning-point of truth.

There is no complete redemption within the nation unless there is redemption beyond it. One reason why Massachusetts is not ready for Prohibition in her own borders is the profit attendant on the extended and thriving trade of Boston in New England rum. It is not possible that a State which is not prepared to protect its own feebler citizens from the extreme danger of this traffic should be ready to shield savage life, hidden away in the dark recesses of Africa, from greater disorder. Nor is it any more possible that a temper, unscrupulous in places remote and secret, should become tender and conscientious at home.

The traffic in liquors between civilized nations is instituted and carried on with the same indifference to human well-being which characterizes it in our own cities and towns. If the sense of personal relation and personal responsibility are more obscure in this wider field, nevertheless, more comprehensive, more delicate and more difficult conditions of the general prosperity are there being settled.

The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; but the methods of conciliation, counsel and good-will by which these results are to be brought about are precisely those which first spring up between man and man in the community and in the nation. No wine-producing country can confine its evils to its own soil. That which debauches it will debauch all who traffic with it. The strongholds of evil are always found with the relatively good. There are its impregnable posts. A use of wines by a comparatively temperate nation, that has much to commend it in social intercourse and commerce, drags the lengthening chain of vice and misery to the last link that runs along the gutter.

The world has done something to shake off the literature of debauch. Manly, pure, spiritual quality gains increasing hold on the imagination. Animal impulses are felt to be hostile to wholesome, exhilarating virtues in the soul of man. But this purifying of fancy is a slow process. It is the washing of the spirit itself. It is lifting life to a higher plane in its unfolding. It is disentangling the fibers of decay and corruption from those of sweetness and strength. This movement of the spirit of man toward its own by which it subdues the world without being subdued by it, or rather by which it and the world spring up together toward new, purer and more vital things,—this process can go forward only by a verdict of the race against drunkenness—the footprints of the demon of debauch. It is time that we look for world-wide Prohibition, which shall set every human eye to watch for, and make every human hand ready to pluck up, the secret and insidious roots of an evil widely fastened on our physical and social constitution.

John Bascom.

Prohibition, Benefits of.—The practical trial of the Prohibition policy in the United States has been interfered with by many and serious difficulties. Great as is the extent of territory, in the aggregate, where experiments have been made since the agitation began, this policy has never had the advantage of a systematic introduction and broad foundation. The National Congress has never enacted general Prohibitory legislation and has never given support to or even recognized the Prohibitory measures adopted in States and localities: indeed, the attitude of the Federal Government for nearly 30 years has been in formal antagonism to Prohibition.[1] The States, with very few exceptions, have uniformly (or with but brief intervals of Prohibition) permitted license under certain conditions—conditions that, in practice, have effectually excluded Prohibitory law from most of the chief centers of population. Thus, in New England, while two States (Maine and Vermont) have been constantly under complete Prohibition for a long term of years, the other four States (Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut and Rhode Island), though nominally prohibiting the traffic at times in that period, have so far inclined to license as to give continuance to liquor manufacture and commerce in such cities as Boston, Portsmouth, New Haven, Hartford and Providence. Kansas and her complementary Prohibition State of Iowa have for years stood alone at the West; meantime the neighboring license States of Nebraska, Minnesota, Illinois and Missouri, with their great cities—Omaha, St. Paul, Minneapolis, Chicago, Peoria, Kansas City and St. Louis—have been aggressively hostile to Prohibitory laws and diligently sought to flood the Prohibition districts with liquor. There is no Prohibition State or county, city, village or township where the success of the policy is not or may not be at any time endangered by the interference of the liquor trade in license States, counties or localities close at hand.

The police power, which is everywhere vested in the local governments and can always be supplemented and made more effective by co-operation from county and State authorities, is theoretically sufficient for the upholding of Prohibitory as well as all other laws and for the correction of offenses committed by unscrupulous outsiders; indeed, there has been no serious limitation of the right of each political division having Prohibitory law to fully enforce the law, except during the few months of 1890 in which the "Original Package" decision of the Supreme Court caused confusion—and the disturbance resulting from this decision was soon brought to an end by Congressional legislation. But though theoretically sufficient, the local police power is inadequate practically so long as liquor is produced and is a legitimate article of commerce in other communities, counties and States. All the conditions for a troublesome contraband traffic exist. Under the most stringent Prohibition there will always be some and oftentimes there will be many persons desiring drink or ready to purchase it if opportunity offers. Liquor is an article easily concealed, and the tricks and devices by which it can be peddled are numberless. The profits promised by illicit enterprise are large and are quickly won. Individual citizens who are not under suspicion may ship in supplies without very great risk, for the search and seizure clauses of Prohibitory statutes, for manifest reasons, are not vigorously applied until there is good ground for believing that a particular person is actually disposing or preparing to dispose of liquor in violation of law. Above all, the highways of inter-State commerce are everywhere open to the smugglers. By a decision of the United States Supreme Court[2] no Prohibition State can, without the consent of Congress (not yet granted), prevent an inter-State railway or express company from carrying to any point within its borders liquor brought from another State. Shipments of liquor from Boston to Portland, for example, are held to be valid shipments by the Courts, and if the shippers use careful disguises the "goods" may escape detection by the police officers of Portland and be delivered to citizens of that town. Once delivered they may be surreptitiously sold or given away, and have a more or less potent effect for neutralizing the law of Maine, in accordance with the shrewdness of the men into whose hands they come, and with various local conditions.

Unfavorable local conditions constitute

---

[1] Prohibitions of the liquor traffic in the Indian, Oklahoma and Alaska Territories, and similar steps taken by the United States Government, have been inaugurated for special purposes and are of little present significance. The enactment by Congress in 1890 of the law permitting States to deal at pleasure with liquors brought into them from other States may perhaps be regarded as providing an exception to the above statement that Congress has never sustained or recognized State Prohibition; but this law was granted simply in compliance with an intimation from the Supreme Court, as an act of justice if not of necessity, and moreover was intended as much for the protection of those States in which High License prevails as for the benefit of the Prohibition States.

[2] The famous decision, rendered in 1888, which became the foundation for the "Original Package" decision. Bowman v. Chicago & N. W. Ry. Co., 125 U. S., 465.)

the next great impediment to the success of Prohibition. Under this head, indeed, all the secondary difficulties fall: for all difficulties are secondary in comparison with the one already noticed—the presence of a legalized traffic in neighboring States and places. The chief of the local difficulties undoubtedly arises from the failure of the controlling political parties to earnestly identify themselves with the cause of Prohibition. This is not at all equivalent to saying that the people, as the source of parties and of government, are fundamentally responsible in cases of neglect or opposition; for the existence of Prohibition implies that popular consent and approval have already been granted. An indifferent or a hostile partisan attitude is frequently if not always taken without regard to genuine public sentiment—at least without regard to the sentiment of the best citizens; party action is controlled by designing leaders, and leaders are readily influenced against Prohibition by aggressive demands, bribes, threats and promises of support from the liquor element. Thus it has happened nearly everywhere that Prohibition has not enjoyed the cordial political support necessary to its full success. Statutory provisions for enforcement have been lamentably defective; penalties have been inadequate and so adjusted, at times, as to render illicit trade scarcely more perilous than licensed trade would be under a stringent license system; men personally opposed to Prohibition, or deliberately pledged to its organized foes, have been chosen to fill the offices most intimately connected with the administration of law — as Judges, Prosecuting Attorneys, Mayors, Sheriffs, Aldermen, police authorities, etc.; juries have been packed with saloon adherents—in short, it has often seemed that the entire machinery of government has been given over to the outlawed traffic. The tireless persistence of all the violators of law, the encouragement shown them by an insinuating and sometimes incendiary press, the timidity of many friends of the law, the lack of determined leadership and the coldness or reactionary tendencies of numerous good citizens (not excepting an element of the clergy) are other local impediments to the enforcement of Prohibition that are repeatedly encountered.

No study of the results of this policy can be intelligently undertaken without frankly recognizing the difficulties under which all experiments have been conducted, and the conscientious student will not make the mistake of judging the fruits of Prohibition by the results in States or communities where for various reasons there has been only an unfair or imperfect trial. The truly dispassionate observer must desire, beyond all, to know what the consequences of Prohibitory law are when working under conditions favorable to its success.

The admission that there have been partial or complete failures does not affect the vital question, Would thoroughly enforced Prohibition be beneficial? But this admission suggests a practical question that cannot be ignored —In view of the many acknowledged disappointments, and of the above-considered difficulties, is the effort for thorough Prohibition practicable, and if not, are the benefits of partial Prohibition such as to justify enacting a Prohibitory law that may be only partially effective? However artfully the issue may be disguised, however strenuously it may be maintained that of necessity Prohibition "don't" and cannot be made to prohibit, fair men will concede that assumption is out of place in dealing with such questions, and that they can be answered only by evidence adduced with impartiality but with proper discrimination.

In sifting the great mass of testimony that every patient inquirer may easily gather, it is difficult to adopt an entirely satisfactory method of classification. It is desirable, for instance, to make a separate and detailed comparison of results obtained under State laws with those secured under Local Option, High License and low license systems; again, the reader will wish to have a separate and comprehensive analysis of the effects of Prohibition upon arrests for crime, and other distinct and equally extended exhibits of the influence that it exerts as a corrective of pauperism, etc.; again, it is proper to show separately how Prohibition has affected commercial prosperity, taxation, the interests of education, etc. But the results of Prohibition in one direction are closely associated with its results in all other directions, and a formal classification would involve endless repetitions. For the purposes of this article the testimony will be presented under two heads: (1) Diminution of the Consumption of Drink, and Effects upon Crime and Kindred Evils; (2) Economic and Other Effects.

DIMINUTION OF THE CONSUMPTION OF DRINK, AND EFFECTS UPON CRIME AND KINDRED EVILS.

In beginning an examination into the strictly temperance results of Prohibitory laws nothing is more suggestive than the unanimity and the vigor with which such laws are opposed by all engaged in the liquor traffic. "RESOLVED, That we are unalterably opposed to Prohibition, general or local," said the National Protective Association at its first convention. (See p. 388.) "RESOLVED, That we are an anti-Prohibition Association, pure and simple," declared the New York State Brewers' and Maltsters' Association in 1883. (See p. 488.) "We have had a great deal of business in the State of Iowa, both before it was Prohibition and since," wrote the chief distiller of Nebraska in 1888, "and we can say positively there is very little satisfaction in doing business in that State now. Ever so often the goods are seized, and it causes a great deal of delay and trouble to get them released; and there is a fear of not getting money for the goods, and all the forms we have to go through make it very annoying business. It is like running a railroad under ground. You don't know where you are going or what is ahead." (See p. 219.) Few will deny that the policy which is most hurtful to the liquor trade must be most instrumental in modifying the evils of intemperance. In the uncompromising hostility with which the "trade" meets every attempt to establish Prohibition lies a strong indication of Prohibition's effectiveness as a temperance measure.

Maine.

Neal Dow, the "Father of the Maine law," in an article in this work (see pp. 411–12) describes the woeful conditions prevailing in that State before the enactment of Prohibition. He says that immense quantities of rum were distilled and consumed there, and that the large home supply was supplemented by a great deal of rum imported from the West India Islands. In another place he has made this declaration: "I think I have seen nearly an acre of puncheons of West India rum at one time on our wharves, just landed from ships. All this time seven distilleries [in Portland] running day and night! Now I will venture to say that we have not had a puncheon of West India rum imported here in five years—yes, I will say 10 years, and there is but one distillery in the State, and that not running, I think; but if it runs it is laid under $3,000 bonds to sell no spirit except for medicinal or mechanical purposes, or for exportation."[1]

These statements are confirmed with the strongest emphasis by well-nigh all the eminent men of Maine. It is impossible in this article to make even a summary of all the important testimony. Only a few of the most conspicuous features of the evidence will be given.

The *Voice* for Oct. 9, 1890, printed letters from the two United States Senators from Maine and other distinguished citizens. Senator William P. Frye wrote, in part:

> "I can remember the time when in the State of Maine there was a grocery store at nearly every four-corners in certain portions of the State, whose principal business was in the sale of New England rum; when the jails were crowded and poverty prevailed. To-day the country portions of the State are absolutely free from the sale of liquor; poverty is comparatively unknown, and in some of the counties the jails have been without occupants for years at a time. Wherever the laws have been rigidly enforced this condition of things has been the invariable result. The people who have tried and witnessed the result of these Prohibitory laws adopted a few years since a Constitutional Amendment, prohibiting the sale or manufacture of liquor, by an overwhelming majority.
>
> "The Democratic party for many years after Prohibition was adopted denounced it in every party platform, but for the last 12 or 15 years—such has been the progress of the temperance sentiment under the law—they have not dared to do so. This year they made a feeble attempt in that direction and were completely snowed under. . . .
>
> "The law is not a failure: it has been, on the other hand, a wonderful success. I do not mean to assert, of course, that there is no liquor sold in our large cities where evasions of law are so much more easily found than in the country. We have laws against murder and theft, but no man is so insane as to suppose

---

[1] Alcohol and the State, p. 352.

that under their influence there will be no murder or stealing."

Senator Eugene Hale wrote:

"Throughout the State generally the Prohibitory law has driven out the grogshop, and while liquor is undoubtedly sold in the larger towns and cities it is not done in an open way, and the amount of liquor-selling is smaller even in these larger towns and cities than in corresponding places elsewhere. Maine people believe in Prohibition because they are every-day witnesses to its good effect."

William De W. Hyde, President of Bowdoin College, wrote:

"The manufacture and open sale are prevented; temptation is to a great degree removed from the young; the business is made disreputable; liquor-dealers are disqualified for political office and positions of social influence which they would hold if their business were not made criminal by the law of the State; and thus the law is slowly educating the people and developing a temperance sentiment which in time will be strong enough to give the law all the support it needs. In the meantime Prohibition, even in its imperfect working, has been a great benefit to the moral, social and economic interests of the State. We believe in it for ourselves, and we wish that wherever conditions similar to those of our State exist other States may experience its benefits."

B. T. Sanborn, Superintendent of the Maine Insane Hospital, wrote:

"The Prohibitory law of Maine has in my opinion operated very favorably in lessening the use of intoxicating liquors, and thereby removing one of the prominent causes of mental derangement. I have no question but that a smaller number in this State are becoming insane from alcoholic stimulants in consequence of Prohibition."

These are merely a few of the latest representative expressions. Others even more notable have been presented from time to time. May 31, 1872, William P. Frye, then a Member of Congress from Maine, sent the following letter to Gen. Neal Dow:

"Your favor of the 26th inst., containing an inquiry as to the effect of the Maine liquor law in restraining the sale of liquors in our State, etc., is before me; and in reply, while I am unable to state any exact percentage of decrease in the business, I can and do, from my own personal observation, unhesitatingly affirm that the consumption of intoxicating liquors in Maine is not to-day one-fourth so great as it was 20 years ago; that in the country portions of the State the sale and use have almost entirely ceased; that the law of itself, under a vigorous enforcement of its provisions, has created a temperance sentiment which is marvellous and to which opposition is powerless. In my opinion our remarkable temperance reform of to-day is the legitimate child of the law.

"With profound gratitude for your earnest and persistent efforts in the promotion of this cause, I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant, William P. Frye."[1]

The interest of this letter was increased by the fact that it received the unqualified endorsements of all the other Members of Congress from Maine, of the two United States Senators, and of the Hon. James G. Blaine, as follows:

James G. Blaine: "I concur in the foregoing statement; and on the point of the relative amount of the liquors sold at present in Maine and in those States where a system of license prevails, I am sure, from personal knowledge and observation, that the sales are immeasurably less in Maine."[2]

Hannibal Hamlin, United States Senator from Maine and formerly Vice-President of the United States: "I concur in the statements made by Mr. Frye. In the great good produced by the Prohibitory liquor law of Maine no man can doubt who has seen its results. It has been of immense value."

Lot M. Morrill, United States Senator from Maine: "I have the honor unhesitatingly to concur in the opinions expressed in the foregoing by my colleague, Hon. Mr. Frye."

John Lynch, Member of Congress from Maine: "I fully concur in the statement of my colleague, Mr. Frye, in regard to the effect of the enforcement of the liquor law in the State of Maine."

John A. Peters and Eugene Hale, Members of Congress from Maine: "We are satisfied that there is much less intemperance in Maine than formerly, and that the result is largely produced by what is termed Prohibitory legislation."

In 1874 the Governor-General of Canada, in accordance with a request from the Dominion Parliament, appointed a Special Commission "to inquire into the working of Prohibitory liquor laws." This Commission devoted much attention to the results in Maine, and the following questions were submitted by it to many citizens of that State, including both friends and opponents of the law: "Is the liquor law enforced, and if not what is the hinderance to its working?" "What have been the results of a change from Prohibition to license, or *vice versa*?" Mr. E. J. Wheeler, in his "Prohibition" (p. 111) says: "In the replies received to these two questions one thing is especially noticeable, namely, that while many, especially those resident in Portland and Bangor, admit that there is a lax enforcement of the law, yet all, without exception, testify to the good results of the law even when it is poorly enforced."

---

[1] Alcohol and the State, pp. 161-2.

[2] In 1882 Mr. Blaine added this declaration: "Intemperance has steadily decreased in Maine since the first enactment of the Prohibitory law, until now it can be said with truth that there is no equal number of people in the Anglo-Saxon world among whom so small an amount of intoxicating liquor is consumed as among the 650,000 inhabitants of Maine." (For the opinion of Mr. Blaine as to the effects of Prohibition on the material interests of the State, see p. 538.)

In 1889 the *Voice* made a systematic canvass of the opinions of representative citizens throughout the State. Questions were sent to the most prominent men in every county—politicians, Judges, Superintendents of Schools, Congressmen, Clergymen, Overseers of the Poor, farmers, business men, Sheriffs, Selectmen, postmasters, Mayors, manufacturers, physicians, lawyers, County Commissioners, State legislators, journalists, etc.—140 in all. Among the questions asked were: "How successfully does the Maine law prohibit the open liquor-saloon in your section of the State?" and "Do you believe there would be more or less pauperism and crime in Maine should the saloons be again opened and sustained by law?" The answers to the first of these questions thoroughly supported the radical statements made above. "Absolutely;" "Not a single saloon in this city;" "Highly successful in this county;" "No open saloons in Portland, but liquor smuggled in and sold to a limited degree;" "In 21 of 24 towns no liquor sold;" "Substantially suppressed;" "Closed nineteen-twentieths," and "Not one-fiftieth as much sold as 30 years ago" were some of the replies. In response to the second question only eight of the 140 failed to express the conviction that both pauperism and crime would be increased if the Prohibitory law should be abandoned. And the names of the persons to whom the questions were sent were all chosen impartially, without previous knowledge of the views of the individuals addressed. Many who answered were old residents, men who, with Senator Frye and Mr. Blaine, remembered the condition of the State in the days of the license law; and they appended such assertions as these: "Pauperism has decreased 75 per cent. in this county under Prohibition;" "Poverty and crime received a check from Prohibition;" "If saloons were reopened pauperism and crime would increase tenfold."[1]

The Governors of Maine for a quarter of a century, without exception, have borne witness to the great decrease in the consumption of liquor and the diminution of crime and other evils flowing from drink, as well as to the material improvement under Prohibition. The following are specimens of the testimony submitted by the Governors:

Governor Chamberlain (1872): "The law is as well executed generally in the State as other criminal laws."

Governor Perham (1872): "I think it safe to say that it [the volume of the liquor trade] is very much less than before the enactment of the law—probably not one-tenth as large."

Governor Dingley (1874): "In more than three-fourths of the State, particularly in the rural sections, open dramshops are almost unknown and secret sales are comparatively rare."

Governor Connor (1876): "Maine has a fixed conclusion upon this subject. It is that the sale of intoxicating liquors is an evil of such magnitude that the well-being of the State demands and the conditions of the social compact warrant its suppression."

Governor Robie (1885): "Criminal statistics show that the law has been beneficial in restraining crime, and the number of indictments found against the violators of the law in all our Courts and the fines and costs or sentences of imprisonment imposed prove the general willingness of the people to assist in its enforcement."

Governor Bodwell (1887): "In from three-fourths to four-fifths of the towns of the State the law is well enforced and has practically abolished the sale of spirituous and malt liquors as beverages. In the larger cities and towns, on the seaboard and at railway centers, it has been found more difficult to secure perfect compliance with the law, but it can still be said that at very few points in the State is liquor openly sold."

Governor Marble (1888): "Prohibition has closed every distillery and brewery in Maine. The law has greatly diminished the sale and use of intoxicating liquors and increased sobriety and morality among the people, especially outside of the cities. It is certainly the best law of which I have any knowledge, and wherever public sentiment favors its enforcement it works perfectly."

The United States Internal Revenue returns corroborate the often-repeated claim that the Maine law has entirely suppressed the manufacture of liquor. Since 1887 Maine has been classed as a portion of the Internal Revenue collection district of New Hampshire, and it is impossible to give statistics for Maine separately for any year since 1887. But the Internal Revenue report for 1887 (the last year in which Maine constituted a distinct district) shows that not a gallon of distilled or fermented liquor was produced in the State in that year.

---

[1] The *Voice*, July 11 and 18, 1889.

The Internal Revenue records of "liquor-dealers," as has been pointed out (see pp. 257, 331), are misleading, and they are especially misleading for the Prohibition States. Anyone may become a "liquor-dealer" within the meaning of the United States revenue laws who pays the Federal tax-fee provided for a retail or a wholesale dealer in distilled or malt liquors. Each payer of the fee is counted in the Internal Revenue records as a "liquor-dealer." But many payers are druggists; many others are Town Agents selling for the excepted purposes; many are petty individuals illicitly selling or intending to illicitly sell secretly on a small scale as occasion may enable them to do, and many are speedily apprehended by the local authorities, forced to discontinue selling after a few weeks or months, and thrown into jail.[1]

Therefore the Internal Revenue statistics showing that in 1887 there were in Maine 919 "retail [distilled] liquor-dealers," 92 "retail dealers in malt liquors," 8 "wholesale [distilled] liquor-dealers" and 9 "wholesale dealers in malt liquors" cannot be accepted as indicating the true proportions of the illicit liquor trade in Maine. Even if they are so accepted, and the figures for the four preceding years (1883, 1884, 1885 and 1886) are also taken into consideration, it appears that during the five years 1883–7 there was only one retail liquor-dealer for each 610 of the population in Maine, while in the same period there was in the neighboring license State of Massachusetts one retail liquor-dealer for each 242 of the population.

Maine has had Prohibition continuously for so long a time that it is impossible to find any recent basis for comparisons of criminal statistics under Prohibition with criminal statistics under license. It is necessary to go back to the earliest years of the Prohibitory act. The report of the Canadian Commission above alluded to has put on record some interesting (though meagre) comparative figures.[2]

The original Maine law (with search and seizure clauses) was enacted in 1851. In 1856 it was repealed and a license law was substituted, which continued in force during the years 1857–8; and in 1859 Prohibition was readopted. The report of the Canadian Commission includes figures from the Warden of the State Prison showing the numbers of commitments to the prison during 1855–6 (Prohibition), 1857–8 (license) and 1859–60 (Prohibition), as follows:

YEARS.		COMMITMENTS.	TOTALS.
1855	Prohibition	29	65
1856		36	
1857	License	52	121
1858		69	
1859	Prohibition	48	89
1860		41	

The same document quotes the following from the report of the City Marshal of Bangor for 1857 (the year after the law was repealed):

> "In my report relating to matters connected with the Police Department of the city, at the close of the municipal year 1851–2, I stated that the city had been freer from crime and disturbance than during the year previous or any year since I had been connected with the affairs of the city. This I attributed to the stringent law passed in 1851 for the suppression of drinking-houses and tippling-shops. This year [1857, under license] I have to report that never since I have had any acquaintance with the Police Department of this city have there been so many commitments for offenses as during the year now closed."

And in the city of Portland Prohibition had the effect of immediately reducing commitments for crime, drunkenness, pauperism, etc., fully 60 per cent. The following returns for Cumberland County (in which Portland is located) were quoted by the Canadian Commission from a book entitled "The Maine Law: Its Origin, History and Results," written by H. S. Chubbs, Secretary of the Maine Law Statistical Society:

COMMITMENTS.	FOR 9 MONTHS PRECEDING PROHIBITION.	FOR 9 MONTHS UNDER PROHIBITION.	DECREASE UNDER PROHIBITION.
No. of Commitments to County Jail, exclusive of those for violating the liquor law....................	279	63	216
Commitments to Watch-house.....	431	180	251

---

[1] If after the payment of this [Federal] tax the officers of the State discover that John Smith is selling liquor contrary to the law of the State, and place him in the jail and his stock of liquors in the sewer, the payment of the Federal tax does not save him. But, just the same, though he may have been selling only a week, the Internal Revenue report includes him of course in the list of special tax-payers for Maine. Neal Dow is authority for the statement that at one time, a few years ago, there were in the Portland jail 40 of these special tax-payers.—*Prohibition: The Principle, the Policy and the Party*, p. 117.

[2] Our summary of the data presented in the Canadian Commission's report under this head is obtained from Mr. Wheeler's "Prohibition," pp. 113–15.

COMMITMENTS (*Concluded*).	FOR 9 MONTHS PRECEDING PROHIBITION.	FOR 9 MONTHS UNDER PROHIBITION.	DECREASE UNDER PROHIBITION.
Commitments to Almshouse........	252	146	106
Commitments for Drunkenness to the House of Correction..........	34[1]	8[2]	26
Totals..........	996	397	599

[1] For five months. [2] For seven months.

The early history of the Maine law in Portland and Bangor therefore proves that it caused a marked change for the better in those cities. Whenever it has been rigidly enforced the result has been no less wholesome. But it is recognized by the Prohibitionists that the administration of the law for some time has been unsatisfactory in Portland, Bangor and (in a less degree) a few other towns. For these imperfections of execution the political managers are chiefly to blame: they find it profitable to permit rumselling to a certain extent, since the illicit dealers are men of influence with a large element of the city voters, and as men who stand constantly in danger of arrest and punishment they are subservient and most active supporters of the politicians upon whom they rely for protection.

Kansas.

The results of State Prohibition in Kansas have been no less instructive and important than those in Maine. Kansas formerly contained some of the most notorious towns of the West, in which life was held at a very cheap rate and wild disorder was a characteristic condition. Vile saloons abounded in these places, and the consumption of liquor was appalling. In 1880 the Prohibitory Constitutional Amendment was adopted by a majority of less than 8,000 in a total of 175,000 votes. This small majority gave no assurance of the successful enforcement of the policy, and the cities refused to regard it as binding and proceeded to treat the law with systematic defiance. An agitation for repeal immediately sprang up and it seemed to have reached a triumphant culmination when in 1882, chiefly on the question of the resubmission of the Amendment, the large Republican majority in Kansas was wiped out, Governor John P. St. John, the man most prominently identified with the cause of Prohibition in the State, was defeated in his candidacy for re-election, and a recognized whiskey advocate (Glick) was chosen in his stead.

All these circumstances render the ultimate success of the Prohibitory law the more significant. Despite the seeming reaction and the continued efforts of a desperate and powerful rum element, the measure was steadily winning its way to popularity because of the beneficial results that attended every honest attempt at enforcement. Previously to 1885 the legislation enacted was comparatively weak; but in that year stronger provisions were added, including injunction and nuisance clauses. In 1887 the celebrated Murray act was passed, prescribing severe penalties, with radical restrictions for the drug-store traffic. In the same year a law granting full municipal suffrage to women was secured. A Metropolitan Police law was another helpful measure. The Kansas legislation of 1885–9 constitutes, indeed, the most remarkable series of Prohibitory statutes ever adopted, far outstripping the legislation of Maine. Meanwhile the State Courts had thoroughly sustained every act. Some embarrassment was occasioned by the manifest hostility of the Federal Judges having jurisdiction in Kansas, especially by Circuit Judge Brewer's famous decision (1886) in favor of compensation to liquor-manufacturers; but the friends of the law felt confident that every disputed point would ultimately be decided against the traffic, and the general interests of enforcement did not suffer. Local Judges in some of the worst rum cities, like Leavenworth, placed obstacles in the way of the cause locally; but even these exceptional difficulties were overcome in most instances. It was not until the "original package" trade of 1890 was developed that the enemies of the law enjoyed a general success; yet this success was short-lived.

There can be no better demonstration of Prohibition's good work in Kansas than the increasing stringency of the statutes and the growing cordiality of popular attitude. Against all the disadvantages to which we have alluded and despite a reaction that appeared to be overwhelming; against the bitter opposition of the saloon people and the most persistent efforts at nullification—efforts in which the liquor power of the whole country and especially the dealers of neighboring States joined, the law has not only been maintained but has been steadily strengthened. Moreover the benefits of the law have changed former foes into warmest friends: men of the highest position, Governors, Senators, Mayors and leading citizens of every class, who were intensely hostile or profoundly distrustful, have been constrained to testify in unequivocal and even enthusiastic language to the great good done by Prohibition.

The abundance of proof is bewildering, and only a small portion of it can be given in this article. Endeavor will be made to atone by careful selection for necessary faults of omission.

Bearing in mind the untrustworthiness of the United States Internal Revenue statistics of "liquor-dealers" for Prohibition States (see p. 505), the following table, showing the numbers of persons paying United States retail and wholesale special liquor taxes, with the numbers of distilleries operating and brewers in Kansas for each year from 1880 to 1889, inclusive (compiled from official data), is instructive:

YEARS.	RETAIL DEALERS.[1]	WHOLESALE DEALERS.[2]	DISTILLERIES OPERATING.	BREWERS.	TOTALS.
1880......	1,907	56	4	39	2,006
1881[3]......	1,188	39	8	25	1,260
1882......	1,512	34	2	22	1,570
1883......	1,949	49	2	9	2,009
1884......	2,025	46	4	17	2,092
1885......	2,151	57	4	11	2,223
1886......	2,401	46	2	8	2,457
1887......	2,182	59	3	5	2,249
1888......	1,396	34	1	4	1,435
1889......	1,350	28	1	3	1,382

[1] Including "retail liquor-dealers [distilled]" and "retail dealers in malt liquors."

[2] Including "wholesale liquor-dealers [distilled]" and "wholesale dealers in malt liquors."

[3] Including Indian Territory for this year and subsequent ones.

Population of Kansas in 1880, 996,096; *ratio between the number of "liquor-dealers," etc., and the total population,* 1 *to* 496. *Population of Kansas in* 1890, 1,427,096; *ratio between number of "liquor-dealers," etc , in* 1889 *and total population in* 1890, 1 *to* 1,033.

It is not, however, by showing a proportionate reduction in the number of persons connected (or nominally connected) with the traffic that the effects of Prohibition upon the liquor trade are to be demonstrated. High License experiments have taught that the number of liquor establishments may be very materially diminished without disturbing the supply or the consumption.

From the Federal returns of the quantities of liquor manufactured,[1] the following table for the State of Kansas has been prepared:

YEARS.	DISTILLED LIQUORS PRODUCED.	MALT LIQUORS PRODUCED.
	Galls.	*Barrels.*
1880............	42,779	32,270
1881[1]............	65,086	25,872
1882............	25,786	24,281
1883............	2,859	25,103
1884............	5,107	25,437
1885............	6,730	19,274
1886............	37,613	17,369
1887............	9,133	16.458
1888............	1,090	14,170
1889............	751	8,290

[1] Including Indian Territory for this year and subsequent ones.

Production of spirits per capita in Kansas in 1880, 0.043 *gallon; in* 1889 (*on the basis of the Census of* 1890), 0.0005 *gallon. Production of beer per capita* (*reckoning* 31 *gallons to the barrel*), *in* 1880, 1.004 *gallon; in* 1889 (*Census of* 1890), 0.18 *gallon.*

From these returns it is not possible to doubt that the manufacturing branch of the liquor trade (which is always the chief bulwark of the whole traffic) has been fearfully crippled. Whiskey production seems to have all but ceased, and the brewing business, in the words of the *Brewers' Journal* for March, 1889, is evidently destined to "soon be among the industries of the past" in Kansas.[2] Meanwhile the number of persons paying wholesalers' taxes to the Federal Government has been reduced from 56 in 1880 to 28 in 1889—exactly one-half, despite the increase of more than 40 per cent. in the population. Therefore all the local sources of supply are being drained rapidly.

The most competent observers have added specific evidence of the practical ruin of the retail business throughout the State. Surely no individuals are better qualified to speak concerning the extent of the traffic than the Probate Judges of the various counties. With them rests the responsibility for hearing and granting applications to sell liquor for the excepted purposes; and they are charged also with the duty of receiving and inspecting the returns of sales made by all lawful vendors. (See pp. 299–300.) In 1889 the *Voice* applied to the Probate Judges of all the 106 counties of Kansas for information as to the effects of the law; and among other questions the following were asked: "How successfully has Prohibition closed the saloons in your part of the State?" and "To what extent, in your judgment, has it diminished drunkenness and the consumption of intoxicants for beverage purposes?" There were replies from 97 counties; for 75 of the counties the answers were written by the Probate Judges personally, and for the other 22 counties by County Treasurers or other officials or by prominent private citizens. Every reply, whether favorable or unfavorable to Prohibition, was summarized by the *Voice.* Ninety-four of the writers declared positively that there were no open saloons, while the other three made qualified reports. Ninety-two stated that drunkenness and the consumption of drink had been greatly diminished. A majority, in estimating the extent of the diminution, placed it at from 75 to 90 per cent.; others said that drunkenness and drink had been "entirely eradicated" in their parts of the State, or "almost totally," or were "too small to estimate," etc.[1]

---

[1] Internal Revenue Report for 1889, pp. 366–9.

[2] In the fiscal year ending in 1890 there was a still further reduction of the quantity of malt liquors produced—in fact, a reduction of two-thirds as compared with 1889. The *Western Brewer* for June 15, 1890, printed a table showing "sales of malt liquors" in all the States, and in this table the "sales" accredited to Kansas aggregated only 2,700 barrels. This indicates a decrease of more than 90 per cent. in the quantity of beer produced in Kansas since the passage of the Amendment in 1880. (See the *Voice*, July 3, 1890.)

Coming now to inquire how far the law has had a repressive effect upon crime, pauperism and the like evils, we find that the Probate Judges speak with equal positiveness of this phase of its beneficent action. The question submitted to them by the *Voice* touching the law's relations to pauperism and crime was intended to ascertain not merely whether there had been an improvement, but also whether the improvement had been great enough to compensate the Kansas communities, pecuniarily, for the loss of license revenues. It was worded as follows: "In your judgment has not the loss of the revenue from former saloon licenses been more than made good by the decreasing burdens of pauperism and crime resulting from Prohibition, and by the directing of the money formerly spent in the saloons now into legitimate channels of trade?" Clearly a fair percentage of affirmative answers to so sweeping a query would have gone far toward vindicating the Prohibitory law against all ordinary criticisms. But the replies showed much more than a fair percentage of favorable ones: indeed, there were very few who did not respond emphatically in the affirmative. No less than 90 of the 97 counties reported a decrease in crime and pauperism so marked as to more than offset the loss of revenue. The following are specimen answers:

Barton County: "It has; our jails empty; crime largely reduced."

Bourbon County: "It has. Under Prohibition our city has prospered as never before."

Chase County: "Pauperism and crime reduced at least 50 per cent."

Cloud County: "Yes, sir. Expense of running Criminal Courts of the county is less than one-tenth what it was under license."

Dickinson County: "Loss of revenue not more than $3,000; saving to families at least $50,000."

Edwards County: "Not a pauper in the county."

Finney County: "Our city and county jails empty."

Ford County: "Crime diminished wonderfully. This city (Dodge City), from having a most unsavory reputation has become exceedingly quiet."

Gove County: "It has. Many former habitual drunkards now sober and industrious."

Greenwood County: "Yes, more than a hundred times."

Jefferson County: "Most assuredly. The only occupant of our jail in the last 18 months was a 'bootlegger.'"[2]

La Bette County: "The revenue from the saloons never paid. The decrease of pauperism and crime from Prohibition beyond conception."

Marion County: "Yes, several times over. A great many poor men now own homes."

Mitchell County: "Crime diminished three-fourths by Police Judge's docket; jails empty."

Norton County: "More than made good; Court and poorhouse expenses greatly reduced."

Osborne County: "Much more than made good; crime, pauperism and taxes less."

Phillips County: "More than twofold made good by decreased crime."

Pottawatomie County: "Revenue from the saloons amounted to nothing compared with decreased cost of crime."

Pratt County: "Not a criminal case or pauper in county."

Rawlins County: "Thousands saved to poor families."

Riley County: "Undoubtedly; legitimate business increased; crime and pauperism decreased."

---

[1] The *Voice*, June 13, 1889.

[2] "Bootlegger" is a Kansas name for the sneaking itinerant peddler of illicit whiskey. It is the practice of these contemptible wretches to carry flasks concealed about the person, frequently in the bootleg—hence the name.

Sheridan County: "Yes, sir; no pauperism here."

Sumner County: "Prior to Prohibition we had 15 saloons and 15 policemen; now only one marshal, who has little to do."

Washington County: "Yes, tenfold."

Wilson County: "Taxes lighter; fewer prosecutions of criminals; decreased pauperism."

Woodson County: "Yes; inmates of the poorhouses, asylums, jails and penitentiaries decreasing; population increasing."

Hamilton County: "Naturally; our jail empty."

Harper County: "Pauperism decreased; only two prisoners in jail in 12 months."

Hodgman County: "Yes; decreases taxes and diminishes pauperism and crime."

Jackson County: "Yes; crime less each year; pauperism at low ebb."

Jasper County: "Taxes decreased for police purposes; less crime; pauperism decreased 75 per cent. in proportion to population."

McPherson County; "Yes; crime decidedly decreased."

Pawnee County: "Yes; taxation and crime decreased; business benefited."

The State officers of Kansas in 1889, in co-operation with the officers of the State Temperance Union, issued a formal declaration[1] concerning the results of the Prohibitory law, in which the following was said in regard to the consumption of drink, etc.:

"The law is efficiently and successfully enforced. The direct results of its enforcement are plain and unmistakable. We believe that not one-tenth of the amount of liquor is now used that was used before the adoption of the Prohibition law.

"Our citizens fully realize the happy results of the prohibtion of the manufacture and sale of liquor, as these results are seen in the decrease of poverty and wretchedness and crime, and in the promotion of domestic peace and social order—in the advancement of general enterprise and thrift. In our opinion the Prohibition law is now stronger with the people than it was when adopted. It has more than met the expectations of its warmest friends. It is steadily winning the confidence and support of thousands who were its bitterest enemies."

An equally impressive declaration (also issued in 1889) was signed by 153 of the most distinguished public and private citizens of the State, including officials, ex-Governors, telegraph, railroad and bank officers, newspaper editors, professors, etc. "These laws," it said, "are as well enforced, and in many portions of the State even better enforced, than other criminal laws. There has been an enormous decrease in the consumption of liquors and in the amount of drunkenness. During the eight years since Prohibition was enacted our population has greatly increased, business has prospered, poverty and crime have diminished and the open saloon has disappeared."[2]

This evidence will be concluded with a few citations from memorable statements coming from individuals of distinction:

"United States Senator John J. Ingalls, (never regarded as a warm supporter of the principle of Prohibition, and certainly never numbered among its active partisans), in a contribution to the *Forum* magazine, August, 1889: "Kansas has abolished the saloon. The open dramshop traffic is as extinct as the sale of indulgences. A drunkard is a phenomenon. The barkeeper has joined the troubadour, the crusader and the mound-builder. The brewery, the distillery and the bonded warehouse are known only to the archæologist. . . . Temptation being removed from the young and the infirm, they have been fortified and redeemed. The liquor-seller being proscribed is an outlaw and his vocation is disreputable. Drinking being stigmatized is out of fashion, and the consumption of intoxicants has enormously decreased. Intelligent and conservative observers estimate the reduction at 90 per cent.; it cannot be less than 75. The increase in the number of Internal Revenue stamps sold by the Collector from year to year is explained by the fact that they are required by all druggists, and many of them are repetitions and renewals for short terms. . . . One of the most significant and extraordinary results is the diminution of crime in the State. At the January [1889] term of the District Court of the county in which the capital is situated, there was not a single criminal case on the docket. Many city and county prisons are without a tenant. The number and percentage of the convicts in the State Penitentiary have been remarkably diminished. Upon the first day of January, 1870, the prisoners, not including those of the United States, numbered 218, or one for every 1,671 inhabitants; at the same date in 1875 they numbered 435, or one to every 1,214 inhabitants. In 1880 the number was 633, or one to every 1,573 inhabitants; in 1885 it was 673, or one to every 1,885 inhabitants; on the first day of January, 1889, it was 861, or one to every 1,921 inhabitants.[3] On the first day of January, 1887, there were 895 State prisoners in the Penitentiary; on the first day of January, 1888, there were 898, and in the following year there was a reduction of 37 in number, although the population of the State had largely increased. In the various prisons throughout the United States about 60,000 criminals are serving sentences for felonies, being about one prisoner for every 1,000 inhabitants; the same ratio in Kansas would give a total of 1,651, which is 50 per cent. more than the number actually confined. In the United States at large there is one pauper to 750 inhabitants; carefully compiled statistics show that Kansas has but one to about 1,300 of its population."

---

[1] Signed by Lyman U. Humphrey (Governor), William Higgins (Secretary of State), Timothy McCarthy (Auditor of State), J. W. Hamilton (Treasurer of State), G. W. Winans (Superintendent of Public Instruction), L. B. Kellogg (Attorney-General), Albert H. Horton (Chief-Justice of the Supreme Court), D. M. Valentine (Associate-Justice) and W. A. Johnston (Associate-Justice).

For the full text of this declaration see the *Voice*, Oct. 9, 1890.

[2] The *Voice*, May 30, 1889.

[3] Since Senator Ingalls wrote before the United States Census of 1890 was taken, these figures were based on estimates of the Kansas population believed at that time to be reliable, but not sustained by the Federal Census returns. The population of the State in 1890 (as given by those returns) was 1,427,096, and this would make the ratio for 1889 1 to 1,657 inhabitants instead of 1 to 1,921.

Governor John A. Martin (a vigorous opponent of the Prohibitory Amendment when it was first agitated, converted to the cause of Prohibition by the results of the law), in his farewell message to the State Legislature, January, 1889: "Fully nine-tenths of the drinking and drunkenness prevalent in Kansas eight years ago has been abolished. . . . Notwithstanding the fact that the population of the State is steadily increasing, the number of criminals confined in our Penitentiary is steadily decreasing. Many of our jails are empty, and all show a marked falling off in the number of prisoners confined. The dockets of our Courts are no longer burdened with long lists of criminal cases. In the capital district, containing a population of nearly 60,000, not a single criminal case was on the docket when the present term began. The business of the Police Courts of our larger cities has dwindled to one-fourth of its former proportions, while in cities of the second and third class the occupation of police authorities is practically gone. These suggestive and convincing facts appeal alike to the reason and the conscience of the people. They have reconciled those who doubted the success and silenced those who opposed the policy of prohibiting the liquor traffic."

United States Senator P. B. Plumb (always known as very conservative on the Prohibition question), Oct. 22, 1889, as quoted in the *Voice* for Sept. 25, 1890: "That there has been a great diminution in the consumption of liquor and in the consequent drunkenness and crime in the State, as the result of the exclusion of the saloon, is everywhere noted and confessed. In fact, no evidence on this point is more conclusive than that the brewers and distillers are so urgent to have saloons re-established. They are not spending large sums of money in this matter for fun."

J. W. Hamilton, State Treasurer, Nov. 24, 1889, as quoted in the *Voice* for Sept. 25, 1890: "It is well known to my friends that when the Prohibition question was first agitated I was an anti-Prohibitionist. I did all in my power to defeat the Amendment. I was what they called a Glick Resubmissionist. But I was mistaken then. The Prohibitory law has my endorsement, not alone because it is the doctrine of my party but because I believe it is right. I do not see how any fair-minded man who has lived in Kansas for the past five years can be otherwise than in favor of the law."

Judge W. C. Webb, April 4, 1890, as quoted in the *Voice* for Sept. 25, 1890: "I voted in 1880 against the Prohibitory Amendment. For four or five years afterward I thought my opinion as to probable results was likely to be vindicated. But it is not so now. Prohibition has driven out of Kansas the open saloon, and has accomplished a vast deal of good—a thousand-fold more than any license law ever did or ever could. A return to whiskey and saloon rule would not bring an additional dollar to the State, nor grow an additional bushel of corn, nor give a single ounce of bread to the hungry, nor clothe the nakedness of a single beggar."

Harrison Kelley, Member of Congress from Kansas, in a letter to the *Voice*, Oct. 9, 1890: "No law on our statute-books is better enforced, and no law ever placed there ever produced such beneficent results. . . . The authorities of the State Penitentiary having made a contract some years ago to furnish prison labor, based upon the then increase, are embarrassed to-day because the contract cannot be filled, owing to the decrease instead of increase, as was anticipated. This is the only inconvenience the State has been put to on account of Prohibition."

S. B. Bradford, formerly Attorney-General of Kansas, is authority for the statement that in four years of enforced Prohibition the cases of grand larceny decreased 15 per cent. and of crimes against persons 25 per cent.[1]

Below are detailed police statistics for particular cities.

The following table[2] shows the numbers of cases of drunkenness for the year ended April 1, 1889, that came before the Police Judges of 61 cities and towns of Kansas having an aggregate population (1888, State Census) of 172,250:

CITIES.	POPULATION (1888).	CASES FROM APRIL 1, '88 TO AP. 1, 89.	CITIES.	POPULATION (1888).	CASES FROM APRIL 1, '88, TO AP. 1. '89.
Williamsburg	850	3	Osage City...	4,500	35
Hiawatha....	2,500	17	Burlingame..	1,800	11
Virgil........	400	None	Iola..........	1,650	None
Girard........	2.500	2	Hays City....	1,700	9
Oswego......	4,000	10	El Dorado....	6,000	33
Salina........	9,000	35	Junction City	4,700	29
Saratoga.....	600	None	Russell.......	1,700	None
Caldwell.....	3,000	5	Enterprise...	1,000	None
Richfield.....	1,000	1	Concordia....	5,100	12
Independence	5,500	6	Pleasanton...	1,700	7
Larned.......	4,000	10	Eureka.......	3,000	1
South Haven.	350	3	Burlington...	3,000	None
Mankato.....	1,200	12	Mound City..	1.500	None
Beloit........	3,600	37	Cherokee....	2,000	3
Douglas......	1,500	None	St. John.....	1,500	None
Meade Center	1.200	1	Leon.........	1,200	None
Belle Plaine..	1,000	1	Lincoln......	2,000	5
Great Bend...	4,300	22	Hartland.....	1,000	None
Osage Mission	2.000	None	Lyons........	3,000	6
Howard......	1,500	1	Ft. Scott.....	15,000	126
Chanute......	4,000	8	Halstead.....	1,500	1
Cimarron....	1,200	None	Kinsley.......	2,000	None
Holton.......	2,500	20	Leroy........	900	6
Kirwin.......	1,300	3	Med. Lodge..	1.500	4
Oskaloosa....	2,000	None	Coldwater....	1,000	None
Lyndon......	1,000	None	Neodesha....	2,100	13
Washington..	2,500	5	Winfield......	9,000	57
Cedar Vale...	900	1	Argonia......	600	None
Manhattan...	3,500	22	Ness City....	3,000	3
Lawrence....	18,000	74			
Garnett.......	2,300	12	Totals......	172,250	679

Thus the total apprehensions for drunkenness aggregated only 679 for a population of 172,250, or one for each 254 inhabitants. In 18 places, with an aggregate population of 24,850, there was not a single case of drunkenness that came within the cognizance of the police. It is safe to say that such a record as is made by these 61 communities cannot be paralleled in any series of license towns of equivalent population. An idea of the comparative insignificance of the total offenses of drunkenness in the Kansas towns may be obtained by contrasting the above figures with the ones for High License and low license cities on p. 211.

---

[1] Political Prohibitionist for 1889, p. 51.

[2] The returns were specially gathered in 1889 by the Kansas City (Mo.) *Globe*. (See the *Voice*, June 6, 1889.)

City of Topeka.—This is the capital of the State, and the remarkable fact that there was not a criminal case on the docket at the January term of 1889 is alluded to above by Senator Ingalls and Governor Martin. This fact is really astonishing when comparisons are made with former years. Enforcement of the law began in Topeka in 1885. According to the Topeka *Daily Capital* for Jan. 1, 1889, the dockets of the District Court of Shawnee County show that there were 222 criminal cases in 1884, 60 in 1885, 30 in 1886, 16 in 1887 and 21 in 1888; that there were only three prisoners in the County Jail at the beginning of 1889 and that only six prisoners were sent from the county to the State Penitentiary in 1888 as against 34 in 1884. "At one time," said County Attorney Curtis in 1889, "there were 140 saloons open in Topeka; their average sales per day were not less than $30 each, which would make $5,200 spent daily for liquor. This amount came largely from the working people; to-day there is not $1 of that amount spent for whiskey. Where does it go? It goes for food and clothing, children and wife. I know of scores of instances where families were suffering for food because their father gave his wages to the saloon-keeper. Now they are living in a cozy home of their own; they have all the necessities of life, and indeed a few of the luxuries; the children, who were once poverty-stricken and living in rags, are now attending public schools, and the father will tell you he was saved by Prohibition."[1]

During the Eastern Amendment campaigns of 1889 Mr. W. P. Tomlinson, editor of the *Daily Democrat* of Topeka, was induced to make speeches against Prohibition. He ventured to assert that Prohibition was a failure, and was quoted as saying that "dives and joints" flourished in Topeka, and that "all the iniquities of secret selling" were "added to the lesser evils of the open traffic." Upon his return to Topeka Mr. Tomlinson was put under oath by the County Attorney, and the following testimony was taken:

> "*Q.* Do you know of the existence of an open saloon in Shawnee County at the present time?—*A.* I do not.
>
> "*Q.* Do you know of any open saloon in Shawnee County within the past two years?—*A.* No, I do not.
>
> "*Q.* Do you know of any secret place in Shawnee County where liquor can be bought by the drink?—*A.* I do not."[2]

City of Emporia.—The following statistics were made public in 1889 by G. W. Paxton, City Marshal of Emporia:[3]

YEARS.	ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS.	ARRESTS FOR DISORDERLY CONDUCT.	TOTALS.
1883	77	53	130
1884	78	57	135
1885	30	69	99
1886	40	26	60
1887	16	15	31
1888	15	12	27

City of Leavenworth.—Leavenworth for years defied the Prohibitory law. This city and Atchison were the headquarters of the "border ruffians" in the memorable Free State contest. It had always been cursed with a large element of rough citizens. With its county it voted against the Prohibitory Amendment in 1880 by more than two and one-half to one. There was practically no interference with the saloons until 1886. Since that year the law has been enforced with increasing success. The results are shown in the following table, taken from the Leavenworth *Daily Times* (a journal that steadily opposed Prohibition during the first five years of the law):[4]

YEARS.	POPULATION.[1]	TOTAL ARRESTS.	ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS.
1882	18,766	2,340	464
1883	19,644	2,110	543
1884	22,455	2,400	452
1885	29,268	2,469	562
1886	29,150	2,110	418
1887	31.220	2,066	357
1888	35,227	1,710	225

[1] These are local population figures. According to the United States Census, Leavenworth had 16,546 inhabitants in 1880.

The editor of this work has received a special report from Leavenworth for the year 1889, showing that the total arrests were 1,800 and the arrests for drunkenness only 120. Thus notwithstanding an increased population the arrests for drunkenness have decreased 442 or nearly 80 per cent. since the enforcement of the law began. And conditions are peculiarly unfavorable. Near the city is a Soldiers' Home, with 2,000 inmates; in fact, two-thirds of those arraigned for drunkenness in the Police Court are soldiers from the Home. Besides, Leavenworth is a "river" city, and is connected with the license State of Missouri by a pontoon bridge. The diminution of crime in Leavenworth as distinguished from mere drunkenness is indicated by the fact that while 36 persons were sent to the State Penitentiary from the county in 1886, only 13 were sent in 1887 and 5 in the first half of 1888.[5]

City of Atchison.—From the county in which Atchison is located there were 23 commitments to the Penitentiary in 1885, 13 in 1886, 6 in 1887 and 1 in the first half of 1888. (The saloons—60 in number—were closed in January, 1886.)[6] George Tofte, Chief of Police, says in his report for 1890: "Vice has been suppressed and the lawbreakers made to feel the penalty of the law without creating any feeling of hostility among our citizens, without any fuss or noise or undue excitement. We have enforced the laws and compelled the closing of places where for years the law had been systematically violated. To-day there is not a 'joint' within the limits of the city of Atchison, and it is safe to say there is not within our Union a city of equal size whose laws are more strictly enforced or whose citizens are more peaceful and sober and where life and property are more secure." (In 1880 Atchison with its county opposed the Prohibitory Amendment by 3,147 votes to 1,343.)

---

[1] Political Prohibitionist for 1889, pp. 52–3.

[2] The *Voice*, May 23, 1889.

[3] Political Prohibitionist for 1889, p. 53.

[4] Ibid. [5] Ibid, p. 51. [6] Ibid.

Dodge City.—The county of Ford (including Dodge City) contributed 14 convicts to the Penitentiary in 1886, 6 in 1887 and 2 in the first half of 1888. (The saloons were closed in the fall of 1886.)

In striking contrast with the foregoing figures are the records of Kansas towns for the period of 1890 in which liquors were sold under the United States Supreme Court's "Original Package" decision. This decision was handed down April 28, 1890. It denied the right of State or local authorities to seize liquors brought in from another State and offered for sale in the "original packages." Immediately "original package" houses sprang up in many places of Kansas, and they were to all intents and purposes ordinary saloons operating under Federal protection. They continued until August, when by act of Congress the Prohibition States were permitted to suppress the sale of liquors imported the same as of liquors manufactured within their borders. The strong local sentiment against all forms of liquor-selling acted as a check upon the "original package" vendors, and since this era covered a period of less than four months the traffic did not have time to reach formidable proportions. But the stimulus imparted to drunkenness and disorder was instantaneous and marked, showing that under Prohibition these evils had been confined within narrow bounds. The *Voice* has gathered official information for a number of the Kansas towns, which is summarized below.

Chanute.—One "original package" saloon was opened, running during the months of May, June, July and August. Arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct during these four months, 26; during the corresponding months of 1889, 19; during January, February, March and April of 1890, 26.

Fort Scott. — Twelve "original package" houses running throughout June and July. Arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct during these two months, 73; during the corresponding months of 1889, 58; during April and May of 1890, 56.

Garnett.—Two "original package" establishments; one ran from July 5 to Aug. 11, the other from July 10 to Aug. 8. Arrests for "drunk and disorderly" in July and August, 24; in the corresponding months of 1889, 10; in May and June, 1890, 14.

Goodland.—Three "original package" concerns, running in July and August. "Drunks and disorderlies" in those months, 7; corresponding months of 1889, 5; May and June of 1890, 3.

Independence.—One "original package" shop, running from June 21 to Aug. 9. "Drunks and disorderlies" in June, July and August, 19; same months of 1889, 6; March, April and May of 1890, 3.

Manhattan.—One "original package" grog-shop, running in June and July. Arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct in these two months, 13; same months of 1889, 5; April and May of 1890, 1.

Leavenworth.—It was impossible to estimate the number of "original package" places in this city. But the Chief of Police reports that many persons who formerly sold with great caution and in insignificant quantities began operations boldly after the Supreme Court decision. "Drunks and disorderlies" in May, June, July and August of 1890, 363; same months of 1889, 289; January, February, March and April of 1890, 227.

Summary for the seven towns: Arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct in the "original package" months, 525; corresponding months of 1889, 392; same number of months of 1890 immediately preceding the "original package" era, 330.

As we have already indicated, Prohibition's success in Kansas is qualified as in Maine, but the degree of qualification, looking at the State as a whole, does not seem to be important when the wretched failure of High License legislation is considered. Cities that were in open rebellion and in which it seemed absolutely hopeless to look for a quelling of the liquor traffic have accepted the situation and have magnificently vindicated the law by their police statistics. A very few other cities are more or less persistent in defiance, but they teach, by contrast, not that Prohibition is undesirable but that resistance to it deprives a community of much attainable good. In the last year a renewed demand for the repeal of the law has been fomented, but the persons most actively engaged in the movement, with few exceptions, are not representative and disinterested citizens of Kansas but the less reputable politicians and the criminal element of that State, and the liquor-producers and wholesalers of Missouri and other States. Kansas City

---

[1] Ibid.

(Mo.) has always been the center of the illicit liquor trade with Kansas; and the pure selfishness and unscrupulousness underlying the whole agitation were well indicated by the Kansas City *Journal* when it said in its trade report for the year 1887:

> "Wholesale liquor-dealers say they have withdrawn their travelling men from Kansas within the last six months, and that they are making no effort whatever to do business in that State. This, of course, is on account of the enforcement of the Prohibition law, which has been more rigid during the last year than ever before. For a time after the adoption of Prohibition in Kansas liquor-dealers in Kansas City did a large business with the drug-stores, but since they have been stopped from retailing liquor the trade has dwindled to almost nothing. Still some business is done in Kansas, but it consists entirely of private orders by mail."[1]

Iowa.

The original Prohibitory law of Iowa (1855) was speedily modified so as to practically permit the manufacture of all kinds of liquor and the sale of beer and wine, though the sale was made subject to Local Option. Special encouragement seems to have been given in Iowa to the manufacturers of liquor, especially beer. Many Germans were attracted to the State, and the brewing business steadily expanded until in 1882 more than 286,000 barrels was produced. The distilling trade also acquired much importance; one of the greatest distilleries in the world was built at Des Moines, and in 1883 (the year of the adoption of the Prohibitory Amendment) more than four and one-half million gallons of spirits was distilled in Iowa. Under such circumstances the majority of nearly 30,000 given by the people for Constitutional Prohibition was a great victory for the principle. It was followed up by so vigorous a display of strength that although the State Supreme Court declared the Amendment invalid on technical grounds the Legislature promptly enacted enforcement legislation which was subsequently improved. The Clark law with its nuisance and injunction features, and the Pharmacy law, take rank with the most rigid acts of Kansas. These measures have been retained intact, and during the largest part of the period since 1885 have had the moral support of the State Government. There has never been a reasonable doubt that an overwhelming majority of the people have fully sustained Prohibition in Iowa and desired its complete enforcement; and the pressure brought by them has been so powerful that in most of the cities a marked progress toward the extermination of the traffic has been observable. But political complications and the artful schemings of influential men have had much more serious effect in Iowa than in Kansas. The distillery at Des Moines for four years after the Amendment was adopted went on producing its millions of gallons. In 1889 the Republican candidate for Governor suffered defeat, and in 1890 the success of the Democrats in the Congressional elections caused a general belief that Iowa had passed into the list of doubtful States. These reverses of the long-dominant Republican party were not materially caused by the Prohibition issue,[2] but the politicians who were committed to partisan policies and methods that had brought disaster deemed it most convenient to seek restoration to power by cultivating the favor of the low classes. Consequently an outcry has been raised recently against the Prohibitory law, and a strong combination to secure its repeal or modification seems to have been organized.

The United States Internal Revenue statistics for Iowa for the years since the adoption of the Prohibitory Amendment (including 1883) are summarized in the following table:[3]

YEARS.	RETAIL DEALERS.[1]	WHOLESALE DEALERS.[2]	DISTILLERIES OPERATED.	BREWERS.	TOTALS.
1883………	5,284	153	8	117	5,562
1884………	4,205	117	3	86	4,411
1885………	3,778	112	7	100	3,997
1886 ………	3,921	121	7	98	4,147
1887………	3,867	120	8	78	4,073
1888………	3,177	84	5	74	3,340
1889………	2,981	85	3	50	3,119

[1] Including "retail liquor-dealers [distilled]" and "retail dealers in malt liquors." [2] Including "wholesale liquor-dealers [distilled]" and "wholesale dealers in malt liquors."

Population of Iowa in 1880, 1,624,615; *ratio between total number of persons nominally engaged in the liquor business in* 1883 (*as shown by Federal reports*) *and total population* (*on the basis of the Census of* 1880), 1 *to* 292. *Population in* 1890, 1,911,896; *ratio in* 1889 (*on the basis of the Census of* 1890), 1 *to* 613.

---

[1] Political Prohibitionist for 1888, p. 14.

[2] See the *Voice*, Nov. 21, 1889 and April 10, 1890.

[3] As in the cases of Kansas, Maine and other Prohibition States, the Federal returns of so-called "liquor-dealers" are not reliable. See explanations on p. 505.

The most striking facts shown by these figures are that the number of wholesale dealers has been reduced nearly one-half, distilleries operating about two-thirds and brewers more than one-half. That the reduction signifies not a mere consolidation or merging of establishments but widespread destruction is demonstrated by the Federal records of liquor production in Iowa for the same years, as follows:[1]

YEARS.	DISTILLED LIQUORS PRODUCED.	MALT LIQUORS PRODUCED.[1]
	Galls.	*Barrels.*
1883	4,285,162	267,390
1884	3,501,529	257,986
1885	3,993,738	169,446
1886	2,396,007	195,457
1887	2,036,774	188,149
1888	706	160,272
1889	575	103,400

[1] There was another large decrease in 1890. According to the *Western Brewer* for June 15, 1890, the sales of malt liquors in Iowa for the year ending May, 1890, aggregated 88,266 barrels—a decrease of nearly 15 per cent. as compared with the production in 1889. (See the *Voice*, July 3, 1890.)

Decrease in actual quantity of distilled liquors produced, 99.99 *per cent.; malt liquors*, 61.33 *per cent. Per capita production of distilled liquors in* 1883 (*on the basis of the Census of* 1880), 2.64 *gallons;* 1889, *infinitesimal; per capita production of malt liquors in* 1883 (*Census of* 1880), *reckoning* 31 *gallons to the barrel of beer*, 5.10 *gallons;* 1889 (*Census of* 1890), 1.68 *gallon.*

Testimony bearing upon the consumption of liquor, drunkenness, crime, etc., is quite as exhaustive as that from which we have quoted for the State of Kansas.

The Iowa State Temperance Alliance in 1889 secured official reports from Sheriffs and others for nearly all the 99 counties. The following is an analysis of these reports:

"Number of counties reporting this law a success and beneficial to the people, 83.

"Number of counties reporting a decrease in crime and criminal proceedings, 73; decrease varying from 20 to 60 per cent.

"Number of counties reporting decrease in consumption of liquors, 75; decrease varying from 25 to 70 per cent.

"The Sheriff's office, from being the best-paying county office, has in many places become the poorest-paid office.

"In over one-half of the counties the jails have stood empty during the past year. Peace and happiness abound in hundreds of homes, where, in the days of the saloon, poverty, want and crime prevailed."

In the same connection the State Temperance Alliance published the significant statement that "a prominent railroad official of one of the trunk lines crossing Iowa declares that 'there is not one barrel of whiskey now carried where there was a car-load, and not one keg of beer where there was a train-load four years ago.'"[2]

The representative judicial officers of Iowa are the District Court Judges, who are chosen by the people and have jurisdiction over considerable territory. In 1888 Governor Larrabee applied to them for opinions as to the effects of Prohibition and received replies from a number. His inquiries were supplemented in 1889 by the *Voice*, which obtained reports from 13 of the Judges and one ex-Judge. Although not all the districts were represented, either in Governor Larrabee's or the *Voice's* list, the answers fairly reflect conditions throughout the State; and in view of the prominence of the writers we condense below the testimony from each District replying:[3]

2d District (Judge Traverse).—"No saloons except in one of the eight counties; crime diminished."

3d District (Judge Harvey).—"Law well enforced; no saloons; reduced crime and criminal expenses one-half."

4th District (Judge Ladd).—"Enforced as well as most laws; no saloons here; drunkenness remarkably reduced; criminal offenses of the lower grade decreased; pauperism decreased; the law clears the State of criminals and 'bummers.'"

4th District (Judge Lewis).—"Enforced almost absolutely universally; no saloons in this district of nine counties; drunkenness very largely reduced, drinking more than one-half; crime decreased more than one-half; pauperism decreased."

4th District (Judge Wakefield).—"Enforced about as other criminal statutes; saloons closed; drunkenness and the use of intoxicants diminished; fewer arrests; pauperism probably comparatively decreased."

5th District (Judge Ayers).—"Saloons stay closed; not a saloon in this district of six counties; drunkenness and drinking largely decreased; crime decreased fully one-half; pauperism largely decreased; criminal and poor expenses largely decreased."

5th District (Judge Henderson).—"Enforced well as other criminal statutes; not a saloon in district; intoxication and drinking very much reduced; a very marked decrease in crime; pauperism decreased."

6th District (Judge Johnson).—"Enforced well as other criminal statutes; closed all the saloons in our six counties; intemperance and consumption very largely decreased; the decrease in Court and criminal expenses compensates for loss of license fees; crime decreased three-fourths in four years; pauperism materially decreased."

6th District (Judge Ryan).—"Law generally enforced; drunkenness much less frequent; decrease of crime over one-half in these six counties; cannot say whether pauperism has decreased."

---

[1] Internal Revenue report for 1889, pp. 366–9.

[2] Political Prohibitionist for 1889, p. 54.

[3] See the *Voice*, April 11, 1889.

7th District (ex-Judge Hayes).—"Practically not at all enforced; saloons temporarily closed, but begin again; drunkenness and drinking not at all decreased; no distinct effect upon crime; some increase in pauperism, but not due to Prohibition."[1]

9th District (Judge Kavanagh). — "Crime decreased over 50 per cent.; Prohibition added largely to individual happiness."

9th District (Judge Conrad).—"Crime largely diminished; cost of Courts very much lessened."

11th District (Judge Weaver).—"Enforced thoroughly; no saloons in this district of eight large central counties; drunkenness decreased three-fourths; crime lessened and jail population less than for many years; pauperism certainly not increased."

12th District (Judge Ruddick).—"Enforced well as other laws for preventing crime; saloons closed except in large cities; drunkenness diminished three-fourths; crime much reduced; pauperism decreased."

12th District (Judge Sweeney).—"In 85 of 90 counties of the State the law is enforced as well as other criminal laws; closed saloons in nearly all parts of State; drunkenness decreased more than 90 per cent.; little criminal business; most jails empty for months; pauperism very materially decreased."

13th District (Judge Hatch). — "No open saloons in this district of six counties; social drinking is still very common, but a few drunkards have sobered up; no change as to crime *per se.*"

14th District (Judge Thomas).—"Reducing crime and criminal expenses; as well enforced as other criminal laws."

15th District (Judge Deemer).—"Well enforced except in one county adjoining Omaha (Neb.); diminished drunkenness at least 75 per cent.; decreased crime 50 per cent.; many jails untenanted; pauperism decreased quite perceptibly; bummers gone; fewer rogues."

16th District (Judge Macomber).—"Fairly well enforced in more than three-fourths of State; drunkenness and use of drink decreased a great deal; crime decreased; pauperism decreased."

18th District (Judge Giffen).—"Law seems to work well in this district."

From a Superior Court Justice (Judge Bank). —"At the September term, 1887, of the District Court of Keokuk, for the first time there was not a criminal case before the Court."

An even more valuable series of reports was obtained by the *Voice* at about the same time. Specific questions were sent to the County Prosecuting Attorneys, and answers were received from 58 counties. Every reply, favorable or unfavorable, was included in the detailed exhibit of responses printed in the *Voice* for June 6, 1889. The following are three of the questions submitted, with an analysis of the replies made by the Prosecuting Attorneys to each:

"How successfully has Prohibition closed the saloons in your part of the State?" Of the 58 replying, 54 stated positively that there were no open saloons, 2 that the law was not at all enforced, 1 that open saloons were few, and 1 that the old and well-regulated saloons had been closed but that the smaller ones had continued because of the difficulty of finding and convicting the owners.

"To what extent has Prohibition diminished drunkenness and the consumption of intoxicants for beverage purposes?" Of the 58 replying, 50 said there had been a diminution, explicit estimates ranging from 40 to 99 per cent.; 2 said, "Very little;" 3 said, "Not at all;" 1 stated that beer-drinking had been diminished and whiskey-drinking increased; 1 said, "Increased," and 1 said, "I don't believe diminished."

"Has not the loss of revenue from former saloon licenses been made good by the decreasing burdens of pauperism and crime, and the directing of money formerly spent in the saloons into legitimate channels of trade?" To this question 49 answered in the affirmative, 7 in the negative and 2 said they could not tell.

E. R. Hutchins, State Commissioner of Labor, in 1889 made this summary of criminal statistics:[2]

"Take, for instance, from the records of the Courts the numbers of those convicted of criminal offenses in Iowa in the order of the years:

"In 1884,	Criminal Convictions	1,592
" 1885,	" "	1,339
" 1886,	" "	1,645
" 1887,	" "	1,520
" 1888,	" "	838

"In 1883, as shown by the Governor's records, Iowa sent to the States 125 requisitions for criminals from justice that had fled from Iowa. Two years later they had run up to 167 in a single year, costing $17,193. In 1887 they fell to 112, and in 1888 but 68 calls were made upon the Governors of other States for the return of Iowa fugitives, and at a cost of less than $4,000.

"In 1885 52 criminals were given over to the authorities of other States upon the extradition papers of their Governors, and in 1888 but 36 criminals were requested from the State of Iowa, showing that even the hiding-places of criminals on Prohibition soil are broken up.

"Noteworthy evidence of the beneficent workings of Prohibition is afforded in the fact that while from year to year the population of Iowa is largely increased, the population of her State Penitentiaries is gradually diminishing.

---

[1] Although this reply seems to be wholly unencouraging, the inferences to be drawn from it are not unfavorable to Prohibition. Judge Hayes's statement that drunkenness, pauperism and crime had not decreased is a suggestive corollary to his declaration that the law had been "practically not at all enforced." And much of the responsibility for non-enforcement in that particular district for several years rested upon Judge Hayes, whose hostility to the act was so offensive to conscientious citizens that impeachment proceedings were brought against him in the State Legislature. Indeed, there is scarcely any part of the history of Prohibition in Iowa that provides so lucid an explanation of certain local failures as the history of Judge Hayes's administration.

[2] The *Voice*, Jan. 2, 1890.

"In 1885,	Inmates of the Penitentiaries,	634
" 1886,	"	653
" 1887,	"	615
" 1888,	"	532

"The number of commitments to penal institutions and their cost to the State each year tell a story also that is worth heeding:

	Commitments,	Cost to State,
"In 1885,	332	$413,000
" 1886.	298	421,000
" 1887.	278	282,000
" 1888,	260	300,000"

The following are extracts from some of the most noteworthy statements that have been made by individuals:

Governor William Larrabee (a sturdy opponent of Prohibition before its enactment, but converted into a most ardent supporter after due observation of the workings of the law), in a letter to Rev. William Fuller of Aberdeen, S. D., Feb. 16, 1889: "I think more than half of the jails in the State are entirely empty at the present time. There are 98 less convicts in our penitentiaries than there were three years ago, notwithstanding the growth of the population. Expenses in Criminal Courts have decreased very largely during the last few years. Tramps are very scarce in Iowa. There are evidently very few attractions for them here. Probably more than 3,000 of their recruiting stations have been closed in Iowa during the last five years. The wives and mothers of the State, and especially those of small means, are almost unanimously in favor of the law. The families of laboring men now receive the benefits of the earnings that formerly went to the saloons. There is no question in my mind but what the law is doing good for the people. My views heretofore advanced in favor of the law are strengthened and confirmed by added experience. Our people are more determined than ever to make no compromise with the saloons. The law has more friends in the State than it ever had before, and I am satisfied that no State can show results more gratifying."[1]

United States Senator James F. Wilson, in a letter to the *Voice* for Oct. 9, 1890: "It gives me pleasure to be able to say that in every desirable aspect of the case Prohibition has been beneficial to Iowa. I have a pretty accurate knowledge of the conditions existing in Iowa, as induced by Prohibition, and I do not hesitate to say that they are all better on account of its presence than they would have been without it. In the several features of the case as respects business, value of property, moral and educational conditions, diminution of crime and criminal expenses, social and domestic phases of society, Iowa is ready to stand in a row of the States for examination with no fear that any of her sisters will, at the conclusion, stand nearer the head of the line than will she."

J. F. Kennedy, M.D., Secretary of the Iowa State Board of Health, in a letter to the *Voice* for Oct. 9, 1890: "In all respects our people have been greatly benefited. Crime and immorality have greatly decreased; social conditions have improved; homes have become more home-like, and thrift and the angels of hope have gone into many homes where the blight of poverty and the demon of despair had taken their abode."

Gershom H. Hill, Superintendent of the Iowa State Hospital for the Insane, in a letter to the *Voice* for Oct. 9, 1890: "The Prohibitory law . . . has proved to be a great blessing to the citizens of our commonwealth. Criminal statistics and various other kinds of statistics, some of which could be furnished from this institution, show that the physical, mental and social condition of the people in Iowa has improved since this law was enacted."

C. F. Williams, Chaplain of the State Penitentiary at Fort Madison, in a letter to the *Voice* for Oct. 9, 1890: "The business of making criminals fell off at a remarkably rapid rate immediately following the passage of the Clark law. Within 18 months the convict population of the State ran down from about 650 to 600. We have two prisons in Iowa, one at Anamosa, the other here. Our Fort Madison prison has the contract labor system. Our 'lock-up' was over 400 when the Clark law passed. The number ran down so rapidly that the Governor was compelled to transfer convicts from Anamosa to this prison to keep the contracts going here. By the redistricting of the State, then in force, 42 counties sent prisoners to us and 57 counties sent to Anamosa. The transfer of prisoners being both inconvenient and inadequate the State was redistricted, giving 48 counties to us and 51 to Anamosa. But this readjustment was soon found to be inadequate. The State was again redistricted, six more counties being transferred to us, giving us 54 counties and Anamosa 45. Within a year the history of shrinkage and consequent crippling of contracts repeated itself, and a third time the State had to be redistricted. This time 22 counties were transferred, giving us now 76 counties and leaving Anamosa 23. And this total transfer of 34 counties from the territory tributary to Anamosa to our territory barely suffices to keep our prison population up to what it averaged, from four more than half the number of counties, before the passage of the Clark law. Or, in other words, 76 counties do no better business in the line of making criminals under Prohibition partially enforced than 42 counties did before the Clark law was enacted. And this is only one phase of the situation. The truth as to the reduction of crime is a many-sided truth, everywhere and always maintaining the unity of fact amid the diversity of aspect, as viewed from different standpoints. Ninety-nine county jails, the majority of them empty more than half the time, idle Courts and reduced expenses are only a few of the many results of Prohibition in 'depressing business' of this particular kind in Iowa."

W. W. Field, Director of the State Agricultural Society, in a letter to the *Voice* for Oct. 9, 1890: "I do not mean to say that no liquor is sold and used in the State, but I do say that the quantity is small compared with saloon times, and that our young men are not tempted as formerly, and are being taught that to drink is to lower themselves in the estimation of the best society. It is rare now to see a drunken man upon our streets, and at our recent State Fair, where there were upon our grounds one day 50,000 people, not a man was seen under the influence of liquor."

---

[1] Political Prohibitionist for 1889, pp. 53-4.

James P. Flick, Member of Congress from Iowa, in a letter to the *Voice* for Oct. 9, 1890: "I was Prosecuting Attorney, both before and several years after the enactment of the Prohibitory law in Iowa. There were eight counties in my district, and I know that after the enactment of the Prohibitory law crime decreased there more than 50 per cent. I know this to be a fact, for the fees of my office and the Court expenses diminished at least 50 per cent."

The facts for particular localities are so abundant and convincing in the preceding testimony that it may be thought unnecessary to devote any more space to details. But the results in several characteristic cities deserve closer inspection.

Generally speaking the law has been best enforced in the country towns, well enforced in the interior cities and least acceptably enforced in those cities that lie on the Missouri and Mississippi rivers.

Des Moines, the State capital, is an interior city, in which the saloons were numerous and crime was rampant and costly in the license days. In 1887 the Prohibitory act was openly defied, but in 1888 it was fairly executed. There was an immediate decrease in crime and the cost of public administration. The expenses of the county, which were above $100,000 in 1887, fell to $30,000 in 1888.[1] In the county as a whole the criminal expenses failed to keep pace with the growth of the city of Des Moines; while in the other counties embraced in the same Congressional District the criminal expenses dropped from an average of $27,000 in 1881 and 1882 to $11,000 in 1888 and 1889.[2]

Sioux City is a prominent river city and was formerly one of the most notorious communities of the West. It was dominated by the rum influence and greeted the Prohibitory law with utter scorn. From the beginning it was understood that any attempt to enforce the act there would imperil both the interests and the life of the person undertaking it; and no one dared attack the lawless traffic until Rev. George C. Haddock and Mr. D. W. Wood began their memorable work in 1886. After the assassination of Haddock (August, 1886) there began a change for the better. The results of enforcement were thus described in a report from Sioux City printed in the *Iowa State Register* for March 22, 1889: "The report of the Grand Jury, made last evening, showed only two indictments, and one of these was against a young man named Petty for seduction. This is the smallest number of indictments returned by any Grand Jury in Woodbury County in 10 years, and may be taken as an index of the results of the workings of the Prohibitory law. Two years ago the County Jail was crowded to overflowing and the criminal docket lumbered up with untried cases. Now the jail is almost vacant and the Sheriff's deputies are idle. There has not been a murder in the city since Dr. Haddock was killed on the night of Aug. 3, 1886."[3] The liquor-sellers and desperate characters were forced to leave Sioux City. They took refuge in Nebraska, on the opposite side of the Missouri river, and built up there two hamlets, Covington and Stanton. Unable to longer ply their trade safely in the city that they had absolutely ruled they sought the protection of the neighboring High License State (to which each of them paid a yearly license fee of $800), surrounded themselves with a choice company of prostitutes, gamblers, thieves and other indispensable wretches, connected their towns with Sioux City by a pontoon bridge and continued to prey upon the morals and substance of that community.[4]

In *Keokuk*, also a river city, the law has been enforced at times and at times ignored. For example, in July and August of 1886 and 1887, the saloons were unmolested, and the arrests for drunkenness in those months were, respectively: 1886, 92; 1887, 120. But in July and August of 1888 the grogshops were closed and the arrests for drunkenness dropped to 28. (See the *Voice*, Oct. 18, 1888.)

Davenport is a city in which violators have been most persistent and successful. It will be seen, however, from the record of arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct there during the "original package" months of 1890, that even poorly enforced Prohibition bears favorable comparison with any system of liquor legalization. In those months (May, June, July and August) it was lawful to sell liquor under the pretense that it had been brought from another State and was offered in the original packages, and the arrests for "drunk and disorderly" numbered 131; arrests for same offenses in same months of 1889, 104; in January, February, March and April of 1890, 68.[5]

Most of the other large towns of Iowa, if the facts could be procured, would afford comparisons quite as instructive as those for Davenport. *Osage* is one of the places for which information has been secured: four "original package" houses were started there in June and ran until Aug. 12; arrests for "drunk and disorderly" in the three months, 23; same months of 1889, 9; March, April and May of 1890, 2. *Vinton* had six "original package" saloons, two of which began selling in May and the others later, and on Aug. 8 all were shut; "drunks and disorderlies" in the four months, 40; same months of 1889, 4; January, February March and April of 1890, 6. In *Lyons* the Prohibitory law, as in Davenport, had not been enforced, and for some time there had been open saloons. These places, under the quasi-legalization given by the Supreme Court decision, sold without caution from May to August of 1890, and the consequence was 65 arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct in these months; arrests for the same offenses in January, February, March and April of the same year, 22. In *Osceola* there were 16 "drunks and disorderlies" in the "original package" months, 7 in the same months of 1889 and 9 in the four preceding months of 1890.[1]

---

[1] Political Prohibitionist for 1889, p. 55.

[2] On the authority of Richard Price, State Senator from the 16th District, in a letter in the *Voice*, Oct. 9, 1890.

[3] Political Prohibitionist for 1889, p. 55.

[4] At the beginning of 1890 there were 31 houses in the town of Stanton, Neb., of which 16 were liquor-saloons. (See the *Voice*, Jan. 30, 1890.)

[5] See the *Voice*, Oct. 16, 1890.

Kansas and Iowa Compared with Nebraska, Missouri and Minnesota.

The opponents of State Prohibition have so sturdily declared that it is a comparative failure, and that High License and Local Option act more beneficially, that it is important, wherever possible, to contrast the practical workings of these policies. Conditions in the West supply a basis of comparison as satisfactory as can be desired. Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri and Minnesota are sister States; all of them are thriving commonwealths, with rapidly increasing populations, growing cities and a predominating agricultural interest. The first two have been under complete Prohibition for a number of years—Kansas since 1881 and Iowa since 1885; the last three have had rigid High License and Local Option laws—Nebraska since 1881 (minimum fee for the larger cities, $1,000), Missouri since 1881 (fees ranging from $550 up) and Minnesota since 1887 (minimum fee for the large cities, $1,000).

The following tables for the three High License States are compiled from the United States Internal Revenue reports.

State of Nebraska:

Years.	Retail Dealers.[1]	Wholesale Dealers.[2]	Distilleries Operated.	Brewers.	Totals.
1881......	962	27	2	25	1,016
1882......	1,026	48	1	29	1,104
1883......	1,047	47	1	39	1,134
1884......	1,556	83	1	35	1,675
1885[3].....	2,393	111	2	30	2,536
1886......	3,035	148	2	54	3,239
1887......	3,423	156	6	45	3,630
1888......	2,833	183	3	46	3,065
1889......	3,534	173	1	59	3,767

[1] Including "retail liquor-dealers [distilled]" and "retail dealers in malt liquors." [2] Including "wholesale liquor-dealers [distilled]" and "wholesale dealers in malt liquors." [3] Including Dakota Territory for this and succeeding years.

Since the addition of Dakota Territory to the Nebraska Internal Revenue district in 1885 caused an increase in the number of "liquor-dealers," etc., for which Nebraska was not wholly responsible, comparisons will be made between 1885 and 1889.

Population of Nebraska in 1885 (*State Census*), 740,645; *population of Dakota Territory in* 1885 (*Territorial Census*), 415,610—*aggregate for Nebraska and Dakota*, 1,156,255; *ratio between total number of liquor-dealers etc., and aggregate population in* 1885, 1 *to* 456. *Population of Nebraska in* 1890, 1,058,910; *Dakota* (*including North and South Dakota*), 511,527—*aggregate for Nebraska and Dakota*, 1,570,437; *ratio between total "liquor-dealers," etc., and aggregate population in* 1889 (*Census of* 1890), 1 *to* 417.

N. B.—Nebraska's share of this ratio should undoubtedly be larger than 1 *to* 417 *in* 1890, *because Dakota since* 1885 *has shown a much stronger tendency toward repressing liquor-selling than Nebraska has manifested. There can be no reasonable doubt that the number of liquor-dealers, etc., in Nebraska in ratio to the total population showed an actual increase since the High License law took effect.*

Years.	Distilled Liquors Produced.	Malt Liquors Produced.
	Galls.	*Barrels.*
1881................	1,817,091	46,105
1882................	1,226,382	54,053
1883[1]...............	1,246,447	56,361
1884................	1,469,642	94,811
1885................	2,153,357	108,445
1886................	1,607,244	133,315
1887................	2,298,260	163,474
1888................	2,897 239	168,379
1889................	2,174,137	174,649

[1] Including Dakota Territory since Aug. 20, 1883.

Per capita production of distilled spirits in Nebraska and Dakota in 1883 (*on the basis of the State and Territorial Censuses of* 1885), 1.08 *gallon; in* 1889 (*Census of* 1890), 1.39 *gallon. Per capita production of malt liquors in Nebraska and Dakota in* 1883 (*Census of* 1885), *reckoning* 31 *gallons to the barrel of beer*, 1.51 *gallon; in* 1889 (*Census of* 1890), 3.45 *gallons.*

N. B.—The increase in the production of liquors was almost entirely in the State of Nebraska. In fact, Dakota did not distill a gallon of spirits in 1883 *and has not distilled any since then.*

State of Missouri:

Years.	Retail Dealers.[1]	Wholesale Dealers.[2]	Distilleries Operated.	Brewers.	Totals.
1881..	6,583	252	135	66	7,036
1882..	7,116	422	72	59	7,669
1883..	7,479	323	122	74	7,998
1884..	6,283	268	86	57	6,694
1885..	6,976	322	71	54	7,423
1886..	6,517	286	68	59	6,930
1887..	6,952	330	62	66	7,410
1888..	5,741	332	64	57	6,194
1889..	5,709	271	79	62	6,121

[1] Including "retail liquor-dealers [distilled]" and "retail dealers in malt liquors." [2] Including "wholesale liquor-dealers [distilled]" and "wholesale dealers in malt liquors."

Population in 1880, 2,168,380; *ratio between total number of liquor-dealers, etc., in* 1881 *and population* (*Census of* 1880), 1 *to* 308. *Population in* 1890, 2,679,184; *ratio in* 1889 (*Census of* 1890), 1 *to* 438.

Years.	Distilled Liquors Produced.	Malt Liquors Produced.
	Galls.	*Barrels.*
1881...............	2,381,719	838,764
1882...............	2.756.346	1,019,873
1883...............	3,210,884	1,050.446
1884...............	3,289.313	1,146.829
1885...............	2,912.840	1,144.325
1886...............	3,310.277	1,203,243
1887...............	3,439,366	1,420,314
1888...............	3,153,896	1,562,528
1889...............	2,459,855	1,669,304

Per capita production of distilled liquors in 1881 (*Census of* 1880), 1.1 *gallon; in* 1889 (*Census of* 1890), 0.92 *gallon. Per capita production of malt liquors in* 1881 (*Census of* 1880), *reckoning* 31 *gallons to the barrel of beer*, 11.95 *gallons; in* 1889 (*Census of* 1890), 19.32 *gallons.*

---

[1] The *Voice*, Oct. 16, 1890.

State of Minnesota:

Years.	Retail Dealers.[1]	Wholesale Dealers.[2]	Distilleries Operated.	Brewers.	Totals.
1887..	4,286	149	...	146	4,581
1888..	3,264	176	..	111	3,551
1889..	2,749	140	2	116	3,007

[1] Including "retail liquor-dealers [distil'ed]" and "retail dealers in malt liquors." [2] Including "wholesale liquor-dealers [distilled]" and "wholesale dealers in malt liquors.".

Population in 1885 (*State Census*), 1,117,798; *ratio between total liquor-dealers, etc., in* 1887 *and population* (*on the basis of the Census of* 1885), 1 *to* 244. *Population in* 1890, 1,301,826; *ratio in* 1889 (*Census of* 1890), 1 *to* 433.

Years.	Distilled Liquors Produced.	Malt Liquors Produced.
	Galls.	*Barrels.*
1887..............	....	331,480
1888..............	....	306,473
1889..............	1,140,061	314,073

Per capita production of distilled liquors in 1887, *nothing; in* 1889 (*Census of* 1890), 0.87 *gallon. Per capita production of malt liquors in* 1887 (*Census of* 1885), *reckoning* 31 *gallons to the barrel of beer*, 9.19 *gallons; in* 1889 (*Census of* 1890), 7.48 *gallons.*

Of course these figures are not conclusive as to the effect of the High License laws upon the extent of the drink traffic and the consumption of liquors. But they indicate, in each State, a much greater traffic in and consumption of liquors than in either Kansas or Iowa. The following are the comparative figures:

States.	Ratio between "Liquor-Dealers," etc., and Total Population.	Per Capita Production of Distilled Liquors.	Per Capita Production of Malt Liquors.
		Galls.	*Galls.*
Kansas:			
1880......	1 to 496	0.043	1.004
1889......	1 to 1,033	0.0005	0.18
Iowa:			
1883......	1 to 292	2.64	5.10
1889......	1 to 613	Infinitesim'l	1.68
Nebraska:[1]			
1883......	......	1.08	1.51
1885......	1 to 456	....	....
1889......	1 to 417	1.39	3.45
Missouri:			
1881......	1 to 308	1.1	11.95
1889......	1 to 438	0.92	19.32
Minnesota:			
1887......	1 to 244	Nothing	9.19
1889......	1 to 433	0.87	7.48

[1] Including Dakota Territory.

For all the States the figures of so-called "liquor-dealers" are of less importance than those of liquors produced. The number of "liquor-dealers" given in the United States Internal Revenue reports, as we have repeatedly pointed out (see especially p. 505), include druggists and others selling for excepted purposes, and for other reasons are unreliable. But the quantity of liquor produced, in a large State, indicates to a considerable extent whether there is a formidable retail liquor traffic in that State. This is particularly true for malt liquors. The bulkiness of beer renders its shipment costly, and in a State where there is no considerable local supply of this article saloons will be relatively few in number—at least in a country where beer is a popular beverage, as in the United States. Comparison of the figures under the head "Per Capita Production of Malt Liquors" show that the Prohibition States have an immense advantage over the High License States.

Criminal and like statistics for Nebraska, Missouri and Minnesota are in all respects infinitely less encouraging than those for Kansas and Iowa. It is true the numerous towns and counties that have Local Option Prohibition are tolerably free from the evils of drink; but they are side by side with license localities and license territory, the good results are modified and the general situation is dismal. Local Prohibition is the only redeeming feature in these States: wherever High License is the accepted policy conditions are as bad as in any low license State, and frequently are even worse. Ample proof of this assertion will be found in the article on High License. Indeed, the facts given in that article for Nebraska, Missouri and Minnesota, when contrasted with the Kansas and Iowa facts, should be convincing. It will be sufficient to present a few additional particulars of the most interesting character.

In 1890 the County Judges of 21 of the 88 Nebraska counties wrote letters to the *Voice* declaring that in view of the appalling prevalence of crime, etc., caused by the license system of the State, they would emphatically advise the citizens to vote for the Prohibitory Constitutional Amendment then pending.[1] "Last year," said Judge W. E. Goodhue of Thayer County, "of about $1,500 fines that passed through my hands in seven months all but one dollar could be traced to the use or sale of liquor. I think the closing of the saloons would tend materially to diminish crime and to improve the social and financial condition of the masses. I advise everybody to vote for Prohibition." "It has been my experience," wrote Judge J. G. Downs of Thurston County, "that at least three-fourths of the crimes that come before the Nebraska Courts may be traced directly or indirectly to the saloons as a cause." "After an experience of four years of Prohibition in Kansas," said F. M. Wolcott, Judge of Cherry County, "I unhesitatingly advise the citizens of Nebraska to support the Prohibitory Amendment." Such testimonies and counsels as these, concurred in by the Judges of one-fourth of the counties, and collected without special effort as the result of a casual and unofficial inquiry—volunteered at a time when political passions ran high and when men holding elective offices and naturally coveting promotion might well have hesitated to respond to a newspaper circular,—must disarm those who assert that High License has been of general benefit. Besides the Judges, the County Prosecuting Attorneys of nine other counties—making 30 counties in all, or more than one-third—wrote similar letters. "I have served in the position of Prosecuting Attorney for six years in Pennsylvania and two years in Nebraska, and was Mayor of a city two years," wrote M. B. Welch, Prosecuting Attorney for Blaine County; "I have prepared over 2,500 indictments and am convinced that nearly nine-tenths of the criminal cases are directly or indirectly traceable to strong drink. I advise citizens of Nebraska to vote for Prohibition every time." (Compare these expressions, procured under circumstances not at all favorable to displaying in a representative way the opinions of the Judges and Prosecutors, with the extraordinary testimony already cited, from the Probate Judges of Kansas and the District Judges and County Attorneys of Iowa.)

---

[1] The *Voice*, Sept. 11, 1890.

An attempt has been made to show, from the penitentiary statistics of Kansas and Nebraska, that the number of graver crimes is proportionately larger under Prohibition than under High License. The saloon's defenders have exhibited much recklessness and dishonesty in this undertaking. The following are the official penitentiary figures for the two States, as presented in the *Voice* for Dec. 26, 1889:

NEBRASKA.				KANSAS.			
	Years.	Prisoners in Penitentiary.	Population.		Years.	Prisoners in Penitentiary.	Population.
Low License.	1870	27	122,993	License.	1870	218	364,399
	1875	59	257,747		1875	435	
	1880	194	452,402		1880	633	996,096
	1881	190					
High License.	1882	222					
	1883	214					
	1884	274					
	1885	329	740,645	Prohibition.	1885	673	1,268,530
	1886	351					
	1887	332			1887	895	
	1888	345			1888	898	
	1889	376	1,058,910[1]		1889	861	1,427,096[1]

[1] Census of 1890.

Nebraska: Ratio of Penitentiary prisoners to population in 1870, 1 *to* 4,555; *in* 1875, 1 *to* 4,369; *in* 1880, *the last Census year before High License took effect,* 1 *to* 2,332; *in* 1885. 1 *to* 2,251; *in* 1889 (*on the basis of the Census of* 1890), 1 *to* 2,816.

Kansas: Ratio in 1870, 1 *to* 1,671; *in* 1880, *the last Census year before Prohibition took effect.* 1 *to* 1,574; *in* 1885, 1 *to* 1,885; *in* 1889 (*on the basis of the Census of* 1890), 1 *to* 1,657.

In Nebraska, therefore, the proportionate number of convicts in the Penitentiary was much greater under High License in 1889 than under low license in 1870 or 1875, while in Kansas there were comparatively fewer penitentiary convicts under Prohibition in 1889 than there were under license in 1880. Kansas, under license, had a far larger number of penitentary convicts in ratio to the population than Nebraska had in the same period. This was probably due to the fact that Kansas was filled with lawless people in those days, sharing the exceedingly bad reputation of the States and Territories of the Southwest and receiving many of the desperate criminals of Texas, Indian Territory, Missouri and Arkansas, while Nebraska enjoyed better conditions. Remembering the remarkable differences of former years, it is not strange if Kansas has continued to show a larger percentage of penitentiary crime than Nebraska. Kansas's bad neighbors have not improved in recent years. The vital fact is that in the period in which the Prohibitory law has been best enforced in the large cities of Kansas (since 1886) there has been an actual decrease in the number of convicts. Comparisons will be very much fairer if made between Nebraska and Iowa, for circumstances in these two commonwealths were practically the same up to the time of the trial of Prohibition in the latter. Here are official penitentiary returns for the essential years:

NEBRASKA.			IOWA.		
Years.	Prisoners in Penitentiary.	Population.	Years.	Prisoners in Penitentiaries.	Population.
1880[1].	194	452,402			
1885..	329	740,645	1885[3].	634	1,753,980
1886..	351		1886..	653	
1887..	332		1887..	615	
1888..	345		1888..	532	1,911,896[2]
1889..	376	1,058,910[2]			

[1] Last Census year before High License took effect. [2] Census of 1890. [3] Year in which Prohibition took effect.

Nebraska: Ratio in 1880, 1 *to* 2,332; *in* 1885, 1 *to* 2,251; *in* 1889 (*Census of* 1890), 1 *to* 2,816.

Iowa: Ratio in 1885, 1 *to* 2,767; *in* 1888 (*Census of* 1890), 1 *to* 3,594.

This subject of penitentiary crime, however, is the least important thing to be studied in looking at the results of any system of liquor legislation. Under the head of penitentiary offenses fall various forms of premeditated crime—like burglary, forgery, etc.—which, while always fostered by the saloon, will not necessarily disappear—or will disappear only gradually—with the abolition of the grogshops. The ordinary services of the police and the Courts, and by far the greater part of public expenditures for corrective objects, are occasioned by the lower and more frequent offenses; and these offenses, as we have seen, spring almost entirely from the legalized drinkshops and are as rare under Prohibition in Kansas and Iowa as they are numerous wherever High License exists. We have devoted considerable space to the subject because the comparative penitentiary figures for Nebraska and Kansas are really the only criminal statistics upon which an argument in favor of High License in the former State and against Prohibition in the latter has been founded. It is a dishonest and a childish argument, worthy of the barroom but not of any intelligent person who seeks to convince a dispassionate public.

In addition to the details given in HIGH LICENSE for particular cities of Nebraska, Minnesota and Missouri, the following police returns for Minnesota cities, printed since that article was completed, are worthy of reproduction:[1]

CITIES AND YEARS.	LICENSE FEES.	NUMBERS OF SALOONS.	TOTAL ARRESTS.	ARRESTS FOR DRUNK AND DISORDERLY.
Minneapolis:				
1886........	$ 500	334	3,903	2,333
1887........	500	334	5,463	3,448
1888........	1,000	230	6,048	3,379
1889........	1,000	244	6,132	3,398
St. Paul:				
1886........	$ 100	...	4,855	2,565
1887........	100	700	7,546	3,976
1888........	1,000	400	6,862	3,493
1889........	1,000	386	6,888	3,447
Stillwater:				
1886........	$ 500	43	683	217[1]
1887........	1,000	48	541	181[1]
1888........	1,000	30	576	166[1]
1889........	1,000	34	615	214[1]
Winona:				
1886........	$ 100	93	485	354
1887........	100	107	340	213
1888........	1,000	37	596	372
1889........	1,000	39	637	303

[1] Arrests for drunkenness, not including disorderly conduct.

Minneapolis.—The police year in 1886, 1887 and 1888 ended with March 31; in 1889 with Dec. 31. The license year in 1886 and 1887 ended with May 1; in 1888 and 1889 with July 1. Consequently the arrests under $500 license cover 27 months and under $1,000 license 18 months. Equating the total arrests we find that there was an annual average under $500 license of 4,835 and under $1,000 license of 7,112; equating the arrests for "drunk and disorderly" these arrests averaged 2,945 annually under $500 license and 3.955 under $1,000 license.

St. Paul.—The police year for 1886 began with Oct. 31 and for 1887, 1888 and 1889 with Dec. 31. The license year began with Dec. 31 each year. Therefore the arrests as given in the table are to be distributed as follows: under $100 license, 26 months; under $1,000 license, 24 months. Yearly average of total arrests under $100 license, 5,724; under $1,000, 6,875. Yearly average of "drunks and disorderlies" under $100 license, 3,019; under $1,000 license, 3,470.

Stillwater.—The figures for this city are of less interest. The change from $500 to $1,000 license was followed by a temporary decrease in the number of arrests and then a rising tendency was again shown.

Winona.—Police year ended with Dec. 31 each year; license year with March 31; consequently the arrests given in the table include 27 months under $100 license and 21 months under $1,000 license. Yearly average of total arrests under $100 license, 433; under $1,000 license, 619. Yearly average of "drunks and disorderlies," 293 under $100 license and 330 under $1,000 license.

Other Experiments in State Prohibition.

The extended review that has been made of the results in Maine, Kansas and Iowa is called for by the crucial importance of these three States. In existing circumstances the decision of the question whether State Prohibition has wholesome practical effects if executed with tolerable fairness rests mainly upon the conclusions coming from a thorough study of Maine, Kansas and Iowa experience; for these are the only States in which there has been anything like an adequate and a prolonged trial of the policy throughout a broad extent of territory embracing considerable cities and peopled by enterprising classes of citizens. In every other State that has tried Prohibition some or all of the elements essential to significant results have been lacking; generally the enforcement legislation has been defective; in most instances even these feeble measures have lasted for only two or three years; discriminations have been made permitting the sale of wine and beer and the manufacture of these and other liquors; political favor has rarely been exhibited and nearly always there has been a general disposition to conspire for the law's nullification and repeal. Nevertheless it will be seen that good has been done by even very imperfect and transitory Prohibition systems — good proportioned to the degree of the enforcement,—and that conditions under the weakest Prohibitory laws have been decidedly better, from the temperance and anti-liquor traffic point of view, than under any method of license in the same States.

---

[1] See the *Voice*, Oct. 5, 1890.

Vermont.—At first glance this State seems to fall in the same class with Maine, Kansas and Iowa. Its Prohibitory law was passed in 1852 and has never been repealed; therefore Vermont has had continuous Prohibition longer than any other State, not excepting Maine—for in Maine there has been an interval of license (1857–8). Besides, the statute has had the general support of the people and has encountered little opposition from public men. But Vermont is not one of the representative States. Its commercial interests are not in a conspicuous way "diversified," its towns are relatively few and small, its citizens are conservative and its population does not show a characteristic commingling of the varied elements of American life. Thus the results of Prohibition in Vermont are not decisive because the circumstances do not bear the tests that are naturally applied.

The last year for which Vermont was separately classified in the Internal Revenue reports is 1887. The following table gives the number of payers of United States special liquor taxes and the quantity of liquor produced from 1880 to 1887, inclusive:

YEARS.	RETAIL DEALERS.[1]	WHOLESALE DEALERS.[2]	DISTILLED LIQUOR PRODUCED.[3]	MALT LIQUOR PRODUCED.[3]
			Galls.	*Barrels.*
1880......	595	10	1,400	None
1881......	473	15	2,335	"
1882......	476	8	1,152	"
1883......	516	13	662	"
1884......	486	13	937	"
1885......	485	9	322	"
1886......	565	8	597	"
1887......	498	9	863	"

The insignificant production of liquors proves that the manufacturing branch of the traffic is unworthy of notice: probably all the distilled liquor made in Vermont is for the excepted purposes. The number of persons paying retailers' and wholesalers' special taxes varies slightly from year to year; even the Federal returns demonstrate that the traffic is not increasing. The average number of such payers for the eight years is 522. The population has been practically unchanged since 1880, and therefore, reckoning on the basis of the population in 1880, there was, on the average during this period, one special tax-payer for each 637 of the population. Vermont's showing is still more creditable when it is remembered that some of the so-called "liquor-dealers" were "Town Agents" selling for medicinal and similar purposes exclusively, and that many of the others were undoubtedly persons selling transiently, in a small way, and whose influence for evil in the community was not comparable with that exerted by even the petty dealers in the license States.

Scarcely any other evidence is necessary to satisfy the unprejudiced reader that Prohibition is excellently enforced in nearly the whole of Vermont. But there are towns where violations are winked at for reasons akin to those that have been mentioned in our survey of Maine—political reasons chiefly. A special explanation, however, is to be made in the case of Vermont; the penalties for infractions of the law are very light there—a fine of $10 for the first offense of selling liquor in violation of law, $20 fine and one to three months'

[1] Including "retail liquor-dealers [distilled]" and "retail dealers in malt liquors." [2] Including "wholesale liquor-dealers [distilled]" and "wholesale dealers in malt liquors." [3] See the Internal Revenue report for 1889, pp. 366–9.

imprisonment for the second and $20 fine and three to six months' imprisonment for the third. (See p. 352.)

Though the opposition to the law rests upon the weakest foundations the conditions in a few localities are plausibly alluded to as justification for a repeal movement by the men whose personal interests or peculiar opinions render them anti-Prohibitionists. High License and Local Option bills were introduced in the Legislature in 1888 and 1890 but were rejected by large majorities. This advocacy of repeal caused prominent citizens to declare their preferences and the results of their observation. Frank Plumley, United States District Attorney for Vermont, wrote :[1]

> "I am glad as a friend of Prohibition that the license advocates have unmasked and are to wage open warfare. Their arguments cannot stand the broad light of publicity, and are easily punctured by the facts concerning the beneficence of Prohibition exhibited in our own State. Take the State as a body, every year shows improvement, both in the vigor of enforcement of the law and the decreased intemperance and resulting crime."

The following are other expressions:[2]

George W. Hooker, President of the Vermont State Agricultural Society and member of the Republican National Committee: "Prohibition is the best law for Vermont, and I base my belief on the almost entire absence of crime. There is no law better enforced in Vermont, and it can be enforced everywhere if public sentiment so orders."

M. H. Buckham, President of the Vermont State University: "I wish I was half as sure of the triumph of other good causes as I am that the people of Vermont will maintain and improve, and still more effectually carry out, the present system by which the selling of intoxicating drink, if not actually prohibited, is to a great degree restricted and restrained."

Hon. H. G. Root of Bennington: "Opponents of the present law make a mistake in saying that the Prohibitory law for the past 30 years has failed to prohibit. We have had an actual Prohibitory law for one year only, the Legislature of 1888 so amending the existing law that it is now nearer absolute Prohibition than any State in the Union. In Bennington before last year there were between 60 and 70 saloons. Now there are less than 6, and they are holes that no decent man would enter. They are patronized by the same men who carry bottles around in their pockets, and who would get drunk anyway."

North and South Dakota.—These two States rank next in present importance, for both have complete Constitutional Prohibition. But the law did not go into effect in either until 1890, and there is no basis for comparisons at the time this is written. Previously to 1890 they were under a system of High License and Local Option, and in a majority of the counties the traffic was prohibited. The results of local Prohibition, compared with those of High License, were so satisfactory that the farmers of South Dakota compelled the dominant party to pledge itself unequivocally to State and national Prohibition and to work for the adoption of the Constitutional Amendment; while in North Dakota the benefits of the policy were so clearly recognized that a Prohibition majority was given in 1889 notwithstanding a general feeling among the Prohibitionists that it was useless to strive for victory against the tactics and resources of their opponents.

There are good indications of the prospective success of the Dakota laws, provided they are retained on the statute-books and carried out with reasonable fairness. Both these laws embrace nuisance and injunction measures, with satisfactory penalties and other valuable enforcement regulations. And evidence of their destructive effect upon the liquor trade is not lacking. In 1890, after the passage of the South Dakota statute but before it took effect, an advertisement was inserted in a Nebraska daily paper requesting correspondence with persons competent to manage a retail liquor business. Many letters were received from South Dakota rumsellers, and without an exception they stated, as the reason for seeking employment, that the Prohibitory law would compel them to close. "The only motive for leaving is Prohibition," wrote one; "Leave this place on account of new law," said another; "Dakota has gone Prohibition, so that I closed out my business," explained another; "Have a saloon of my own and have had for the last two years, but as Prohibition takes effect May 1, I would like a situation," answered another; "The Prohibition bill takes effect May 1, so it is a case of go," responded another. A liquor-dealer in Canton, S. D., gave this account of himself: "I have had Elven years experienc in running a first class Saloon of my own and I can say successfully untill within the last three years. Three years ago they sprung 'Local Option' on us. We have fought them with money and everything else, but to no avail for now we have Prohibition good and strong and on the 1st May next we must go."[1]

---

[1] The *Voice*, Feb. 6, 1890.

[2] Ibid, Feb. 13, 1890.

New Hampshire, permitting the manufacture of liquor and influenced in its politics to a great extent by wealthy brewers, is not strictly a Prohibition State. Even the prohibition of the retail sale did not finally become absolute until 1881, when the right granted to towns to tolerate the traffic in lager beer was withdrawn. As a matter of course this partial Prohibitory law has not operated so successfully or beneficially as the measures already noticed. The following are the Federal statistics of the liquor business for the years 1880–7 (inclusive), 1887 being the last year for which the New Hampshire figures are given separately in the Internal Revenue records :

YEARS.	RETAIL DEALERS.[1]	WHOLESALE DEALERS.[2]	DISTILLED LIQUORS PRODUCED.[3]	MALT LIQUORS PRODUCED.[3]
			Galls.	*Barrels.*
1880......	987	43	48.535	183,645
1881......	1,162	39	50,242	202,552
1882......	1,231	41	46,923	252.706
1883......	1,288	52	39,460	270,628
1884......	1,287	38	39,478	323,449
1885......	1,327	46	33,609	320,115
1886......	1,298	50	25,758	329.130
1887......	1,379	50	22,742	317,685

[1] Including "retail liquor-dealers [distilled]" and "retail dealers in malt liquors." [2] Including "wholesale liquors-dealers [distilled]" and "wholesale dealers in malt liquors." [3] Internal Revenue report for 1889, pp. 366–9.

The population of New Hampshire did not increase materially between 1880 (346,991) and 1887. On the basis of the Census of 1880 there was in that period, on the average, one special liquor taxpayer (not including brewers and distillers) for each 269 inhabitants. The average per capita production of distilled spirits was 0.11 gallon; of malt liquor (reckoning 31 gallons to the barrel of beer), 24.67 gallons. The statistics of liquor manufacture explain the statistics of "liquor-dealers." It is inevitable that in a State where the manufacturing interest is powerful there will be made a considerable wholesale and retail market. In practice the New Hampshire law operates more as a Local Option than as a Prohibitory act, the traffic being intrenched in the important localities because of the legal standing that its most prominent representatives enjoy. But well-informed citizens of New Hampshire declare that the sale is suppressed in by far the greater number of towns and in practically all the unincorporated parts of the State. And the Injunction act of 1887 has strengthened the friends of the law in places where enforcement was formerly difficult. Successful crusades against the open saloon have been waged in the cities from time to time under this act, and there can be no doubt that more stringent legislation—especially legislation against the manufacture—would render Prohibition fully as efficient in New Hampshire as it has been in the neighboring States of Maine and Vermont.

We have now examined the workings of all the existing State Prohibitory laws. As for the Territorial laws of the *Indian, Oklahoma* and *Alaska* Territories, the effects of these measures have never been investigated. In the Indian and Alaska Territories they are intended chiefly to prevent the traffic with the aborigines, and, having been established as police regulations by the United States Government (which certainly is not disposed to resort to Prohibition without definite cause, or to maintain it if ineffectual), it may be assumed that the former license measures were complete failures, and that Prohibition has become recognized in these Territories as the only acceptable policy for restraining crime, intemperance, etc. Oklahoma was erected out of the Indian Territory in 1889, and multitudes of adventurers, eager to acquire the rich lands, swarmed into it when the President's proclamation authorizing settlement took effect. Cities were thrown up in a few days, personal selfishness was the controlling motive, desperate and questionable characters were there in large numbers, and serious conflicts were imminent. The representatives of the Federal Government were the only persons having police authority, and a considerable time elapsed before systematic administration of law was possible. Throughout this period the sale of liquor was prohibited, and the Federal officers had instructions to enforce the anti-liquor provisions. Mr. J. A. Pickler, Member of Congress from South Dakota, who was in Oklahoma for two months as an agent of the Interior Department, has made the following statement:

---

[1] The *Voice*, May 15, 1890.

> "Fifty thousand people came into Oklahoma within 24 hours, all strangers to each other, as many as a dozen men claiming one town lot, on which they had squatted, and four or five claiming the same tract of land. With no laws to govern this people except the general laws of the United States, without a Governor, Sheriff or constable, we had perfect peace and order, with no bloodshed whatever for six months. I, as did all thinking men, attributed it to the Prohibition by the Government of any liquor being brought into the Territory."[1]

The more important of the State Prohibitory laws that have been repealed will be noticed next.

Rhode Island.—The history of Prohibition is of special interest in this State because of the number of changes made from license to Prohibition and from Prohibition to license, and because this is the only commonwealth in which a Prohibitory Constitutional Amendment has been rescinded by popular vote. The original act was passed in 1852, modified in 1853 because of the unconstitutionality of certain features and repealed in 1863. In 1874 another Prohibitory law was adopted, which gave way to license the next year. In April, 1886, an Amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale was inserted in the Constitution, and in May the Legislature enacted an enforcement statute; the Amendment was destroyed in June, 1889, and license was restored the next month. (For explanations, etc., see pp. 109–10, 124–5.)

The statute of 1852–63, lacking some provisions essential to a vigorous administration of it, is hardly to be regarded as a Prohibitory law proper; and we have been unable to obtain any satisfactory information touching its results. The act of 1874, remembering that it was in force for only one year, had excellent effects, effects so injurious to the traffic that a supreme effort to secure its repeal was set on foot without delay. Governor Howard made this declaration in October, 1874: "Not from the standpoint of a temperance man, but as a public man with a full sense of the responsibility which attaches to me from my representative position, I say that to-day the Prohibitory laws of this State, if not a complete success, are a success beyond the fondest anticipation of any friend of temperance, in my opinion. Prohibitory legislation is a success in Rhode Island to a marvelous extent."[2]

The Prohibitory Amendment and legislation of 1886–9, for reasons that have been referred to elsewhere (see pp. 124–5), were denied a decent trial. They were borne down by intrigue and conspiracy. At the very beginning of this period the Board of State Police, which was specially created to enforce the policy, was regarded with grave distrust, for the man who was put at its head did not have the confidence of the people. The Legislature refused to add necessary amendments to the statute, and before two years had passed it was generally understood that the managing politicians and many of the influential law officers had no other purpose in view than to render the law ridiculous and odious by non-enforcement. In spite of these unfavorable circumstances it was partially enforced, and with uniformly wholesome consequences. The number of persons paying United States special taxes as retail and wholesale dealers fell from 1,544 in 1886 to 1,241 in 1887. (The numbers for subsequent years cannot be given, since Rhode Island was consolidated with the Internal Revenue collection district of Connecticut on July 1, 1887.) In Providence, the principal city, the arrests for crime, drunkenness and disorderly conduct were greatly reduced in the first year. The figures are as follows:

Total Arrests for All Causes Except for Sale of Liquor.—Year ending June 30, 1886 (license), 6,473; year ending June 30, 1887 (Prohibition), 4,087—decrease, 37 per cent.

Arrests for Drunkenness, Common Drunkards and Disorderly.—Year ending June 30, 1886 (license), 2,617; year ending June 30, 1887 (Prohibition), 1,521—decrease, 42 per cent.[3]

In each of these years Providence had the same Chief of Police, and therefore the decrease was not brought about by any change in the Police Department. In the next year there was an increase, not large enough, however, to bring the total up to the number of arrests made in the last year of license. The record for two and one-half years of Prohibition (ending with Jan. 1, 1889) showed 9,923 arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct in Providence in that period, as against 11,304 in the last two and one-half years of license — a decrease of about 2,000.[1]

---

[1] The *Voice*, Dec. 19, 1889.

[2] Alcohol and the State, p. 335.

[3] Wheeler's "Prohibition," p. 134.

In the closing year of the Prohibitory law, beginning with the summer of 1889, the newly-elected Attorney-General of the State, Horatio Rogers, contrary to expectation, entered upon a fearless enforcement crusade, bringing cases to trial and laying foundations for complete extermination of the open trade. This work, however, only hastened the repeal, for it taught the rumsellers and their political allies that the traffic could be saved only by prompt action.

With the return of licensed saloons crime and intemperance were immediately stimulated. In the latter part of 1889 the criminal docket of the Court of Common Pleas of Providence County was the largest in the history of that Court. The Providence *Journal*, which had clamored for the repeal of Prohibition and had predicted that High License would reduce the evils of the business, said, Jan. 30, 1890:

> "During the period of Prohibition in this State and the discussions of reform incident thereto it was promised by the advocates of High License, as one of the chief inducements to change to their system, that a good High License law, properly enforced, would materially reduce the number of places maintained for the selling of liquor, thus decreasing the agencies of temptation to the thoughtless and bringing the liquor traffic within limits where it could be conveniently and satisfactorily controlled. It must be plain, however, not only by the statistics of licenses lately published in these columns, but by common observation as well, that the happy result predicted has not been brought about under Rhode Island's new license law. The saloons seem to have increased. Complete and absolutely accurate statistics are not, indeed, obtainable. But there are probably not less than 1,200 licensed saloons in the State to-day, while at the close of the low license period in June, 1886, it was estimated that the number was a little over 900, certainly not more than 950. Indeed, during the lawlessness of the Prohibition period itself there were hardly more tippling-places of all sorts in the State than there are licensed places now. In Providence, in June, 1886, the last month of the operation of the low license law, there were on record in this city 444 licensed saloons. To-day there are 532, and the tendency is still upward. . . . It does not appear, then, that in this respect we are much better off to-day. In point of numbers, indeed, we are not so well off as we were under low license, even allowing for a substantial growth in population in the last four years."

The newspapers of the other cities commented on the situation in the same strain. The Pawtucket *Daily Gazette and Chronicle* said, Sept. 20, 1889:

> "More drunken men were seen on our streets during the past week than were seen here in the three years of the non-enforced Prohibitory law."

And the Newport *Daily News* said, Sept. 28, 1889:

> "Drunkenness is increasing, and it appears to be the general sentiment of the community that no more liquor licenses should be granted. Men under the influence of liquor, but not in any way unable to reach their destination, are seen on any hand by the police and others."

Connecticut.—In this State the Prohibitory law, enacted in 1852 and repealed in 1872, was not thoroughly enforced at any time. During the early years of the act, however, the condition of the State was clearly so much better than it had been under license that the warmest encomiums were pronounced. Governor Dutton said in 1855: "There is scarcely an open grogshop in the State, the jails are fast becoming tenantless and a delightful air of security is everywhere enjoyed." And Governor Minor in 1856 said: "From my own knowledge, and from information from all parts of the State, I have reason to believe that the law has been enforced, and the daily traffic in liquors has been broken up and abandoned." Dr. Leonard Bacon said that "Its [the law's] effect in promoting peace, order, quiet and general prosperity no man can deny. Never for 20 years has our city [New Haven] been so quiet as under its action." (This statement is of unusual interest since Dr. Bacon has long been prominent as an opponent of the principle of Prohibition.) E. P. Augur of Middletown, Conn., has compiled from official records a table giving the numbers of commitments to jail for all offenses, commitments for drunkenness, for assault, for vagrancy, etc., since 1852. The following, taken from Mr. Augur's table, compares commitments during the last seven years of the Prohibitory law and the first seven years of the license law that replaced it:

---

[1] On the authority of Mr. Walter B. Frost of Providence. (See the *Voice* for March 7, 1889.)

Years.		Total Commitments.	Commitments for Drunkenness and Common Drunkards.	Assault, Assault and Battery, and Breach of Peace.	Vagrancy.
Prohibition.	1866	1,827	537	273	67
	1867	1,693	484	275	63
	1868	1,821	575	280	75
	1869	2,246	842	428	62
	1870	2,593	1,050	202	97
	1871	2,805	1,290	839	110
	1872	2,985	1,470	447	164
License & Loc. Op.	1873	4.481	2,125	594	170
	1874	4,448	2,044	661	214
	1875	4,425	2,175	734	235
	1876[1]	3,103	1,347	391	149
	1877	4.149	1,734	571	193
	1878	4,577	2,141	572	279
	1879[2]	3,834	1,628	436	221
Tot. Proh. Yrs.		15,970	6,248	2,244	638
" Lic. "		29.017	13,194	4,019	1,461

[1] Eight months only. [2] Tramp law went into effect.

According to this table, in the seven license years as compared with the seven Prohibition years the commitments for all offenses increased 82 per cent., for drunkenness and common drunkards 111 per cent., for assault, assault and battery and breach of peace 79 per cent., and for vagrancy 129 per cent. Meanwhile the increase in population was about 1.76 per cent. per year, or only 12.32 per cent. in seven years. [1]

Since the repeal of Prohibition in 1872 the license and Local Option law has been steadily maintained. The increase of crime and drunkenness has been constant. For the year ending June 30, 1887, the total number of commitments for crime was 6,849 and of commitments for drunkenness 3,388. The following are comparisons for three decennial years, beginning with 1867:

Commitments for Crime.—For 1867 (the last year under the Prohibitory law before the repeal agitation became active), 1,693; population in 1870, 537,454; ratio of commitments in 1867 to total population (on the basis of the Census of 1870), 1 to 317. For 1877 (the fifth year of license), 4,149; population in 1880, 622,700; ratio, 1 commitment to 150 inhabitants. For 1887 (the fifteenth year of license), 6,849; population in 1890, 746,258; ratio, 1 commitment to 109 inhabitants.

Commitments for Drunkenness.—For 1867, 484; ratio (on the basis of the Census of 1870), 1 to 1,110 inhabitants. For 1877, 1,734; ratio (on the basis of the Census of 1880), 1 to 359 inhabitants. For 1887, 3,388; ratio (on the basis of the Census of 1890), 1 to 220 inhabitants.

These startling figures make it perfectly plain that even under the poorly-enforced Prohibitory law, Connecticut (so long as that law was undisturbed) was a sober State and was remarkably free from crime; while under the present license system (even with the advantage of Local Option Prohibition in a majority of the towns) the commitments for crime, after making allowance for the increase in population, are relatively three times more numerous and the number of commitments for drunkenness is five times as great.

Massachusetts.—This State adopted many interesting restrictive measures long before the Maine law was enacted; and in 1848 a complete Prohibitory act (with search and seizure clauses) was framed and introduced in the Legislature.[2] The passage of this bill would have deprived Maine of the distinction that she enjoys; but it was defeated. In 1852 a Maine Prohibitory law was adopted in Massachusetts and it endured until 1868, when a license law took its place. In 1869 Prohibition was re-enacted and in 1875 the State again changed to license. It has retained the license system ever since, subject to Local Option modifications. Neither of the two Prohibitory laws was perfect in its enforcement features, and the execution was lax during most of the time.

In spite of all difficulties there is conclusive contemporaneous testimony to the fact that the condition of the State was decidedly improved in the first years of the policy. It will suffice to present here a statement made by Gen. Benjamin F. Butler, for other evidence is to the same effect. Gen. Butler, it is worthy of remark, is not classed with the Prohibitionists or even the active temperance sympathizers. In a letter in the *Voice* for Dec. 26, 1889, he wrote:

---

[1] It should be borne in mind also that the seven years of Prohibition law here given were in most respects the worst years for the law, ensuing immediately after the return to civil life of the Federal soldiers with the drink habits formed amid the hardships of camp life, and being years during which an incessant agitation for the repeal of the law was kept up.—*Wheeler's "Prohibition,"* p. 108.

[2] The bill was reported and ably advocated by Francis W. Emmons of Sturbridge. It was petitioned for by the venerable Moses Stuart of Andover and 5,000 others. The legislative committee, in its report, unanimously agreed that "the present license law, in our judgment, has done and is doing incalculable mischief." It added: "Public opinion, we are happy to know, is in advance of this law, which appears from the fact that during the last year no licenses have been granted under it in 13 out of the 14 counties in this Commonwealth." (See "Alcohol and the State," pp. 287-8.)

> "Massachusetts in 1853 had a very efficient Prohibitory law, which I drafted as counsel for the Temperance Alliance, with the aid of one of the very best lawyers of that day, the Hon. Samuel Hoar. . . . I was afterward employed by the State Temperance Alliance to enforce that Prohibitory law in the city of Lowell and county of Middlesex where I lived, and the law was enforced in that portion of the State which was covered by my retainer, and the sale of liquor was as fully stopped as was the stealing of goods and chattels in the same localities by the ordinary laws against such crime."

The second important period of enforcement began in 1865, with the creation of the State Constabulary. "During that year alone," says Judge Pitman, "the work of the State Police resulted in 5,331 liquor prosecutions, 1,979 seizures aggregating 92,658 gallons of intoxicants, and the payment in fines and costs of $226,427.19. (See 2d annual report of the Constable of the Commonwealth.) That the result was a great diminution of the traffic hardly requires proof. The same report gives 819 as the number of dealers who had discontinued the traffic during that year alone."[1] This vigorous enforcement was continued until the fall of 1867. "Up to the 6th of November, 1867," reported the Constable of the Commonwealth, "there was not an open bar known in the entire State, and the open retail traffic had almost entirely ceased. The traffic, as such, had generally secluded itself to such an extent that it was no longer a public, open offense and no longer an inviting temptation to the passer-by."[2] These successful assaults caused the entire rum element to rally for a desperate attack upon the law, and at the elections of 1867 an anti-Prohibition Legislature was chosen. The result was that "between the day of the election and the 1st of April ensuing 2,779 new liquor-shops were opened."[3] The comparative statistics of commitments for crime, etc., during the three periods of unenforced Prohibition, enforced Prohibition and license are remarkable. We summarize them briefly.[4]

Commitments to the State Prison.—In the first nine months of 1866 (before the results of enforcement had their full effect upon the higher forms of crime), 156; during the first nine months of 1866, 80; during the first nine months of 1868, 143.

Police Figures for the City of Boston (where the law was not so well administered as in other parts of the State).—Last six months of 1868 (license), as compared with the last six months of 1867 (Prohibition): increase in criminal arrests, 248; increase in number of station-house lodgers, 3,338; increase in cases of drunkenness and assault, 1,363—total increase under these three heads, 5,449. (N. B.—In the last six months of 1867, with which comparisons are made, there were two months of unenforced Prohibition; so that the relative increase must have been even larger than these figures show.)

Commitments in the Entire State for Drunkenness.—Six months of 1867 (April to October), 2,501; same months of 1868, 3,170. (N. B.—These figures, of course, do not represent all the arrests for drunkenness. Persons apprehended for this offense were not committed unless they were unable to pay fines.)

"The Governor of the State (Claflin), the State Constable, the Board of Inspectors of the State Prison, and the Board of State Charities," says Mr. Wheeler, "all called attention, in very emphatic language, to this increase of crime, and *all, without exception, attributed it to the repeal of the Prohibitory law.* In consequence of this increase of crime Prohibition was re-enacted, going into force January, 1870, but in the same year additional legislation was enacted exempting malt liquors from the provisions of the law."[5]

The third and final era of actual Prohibition in Massachusetts began in 1873, after the beer-exemption clauses were rescinded. Concerning the results we quote from Judge Pitman:

> "An increasingly vigorous prosecution of the law took place up to the fall election of 1874, when the law was again overthrown. The prosecutions for that year were 7,126; seizures, 5,912 aggregating 117,683 gallons; fines and costs paid, $152,189.62; number sentenced to the House of Correction, 820. Of the results of this action on a single branch of the trade Mr. Schade, the special agent of the Brewers' Congress, says: 'Had our friends in Massachusetts been free to carry on their business and had not the State authorities constantly interfered, there is no doubt that instead of showing a decrease of 116,585 barrels in one year they would have increased at the same rate as they did the preceding year.' Again we note that the law was repealed not because it was weak but because it was strong. . . .
>
> "The city of Boston has always opposed Prohibition. Yet at the time of the great fire, in November, 1872, the order was given by the city to close all the dramshops. 'The good

---

[1] Alcohol and the State, pp. 337-8.

[2] Ibid, p. 338. [3] Ibid, p. 340.

[4] See Wheeler's "Prohibition," pp. 102-4.

[5] Ibid, p. 104.

effects of this course,' say the State Police Commissioners, 'were manifest in the quiet streets of the city by day and night, even when in the absence of gas they were shrouded in darkness.' The Chief of the City Police reported that the number of arrests for 10 days before the order was 1,169; for the 10 days after, only 675."[1]

The lessons from these experiments in Massachusetts are as impressive as any furnished by the existing conditions in Kansas and Iowa. Prohibition is the only system in that State which has crushed the liquor traffic or diminished its evils. This conclusion is inevitable from every point of view that can be taken. The facts are equally clear and convincing whether we study the consequences of the low license policy in 1868–9 and 1875–88, or of the High License policy—under which, be it remembered, the highest license fees prevailing in the Union are charged—that has been in force since May 1, 1889. The failure of the High License law is partly demonstrated in the article on HIGH LICENSE; other particulars will be found in our comparison of High License and Local Option Prohibition for separate cities of Massachusetts. (See pp. 531–3.)[2]

The remaining States that have had general Prohibition of some kind afford no grounds for important deductions. *Michigan* was under an anti-license and nominally Prohibitory law from 1855 to 1875; but it was amended so as to except the manufacture of alcohol, wine and beer, and the sale of beer, etc. In view of this fact it is needless to inquire as to the effects of the measure:—it can hardly be called even a partial Prohibitory statute, since it fostered the most dangerous and vilest single element of the retail traffic, the beer-saloon. *New*

---

[1] Alcohol and the State, pp. 342–3.

[2] In connection with this general review of Massachusetts it is of interest to present certain statistics gathered by the Hon. Carroll D. Wright, for many years Chief of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, and now (1890) Commissioner of the United States Department of Labor. In his reports as Chief of the Massachusetts Bureau for 1880 and 1881 Mr. Wright made exhaustive analyses, from official returns, of the "Influence of Intemperance upon Crime." While these analyses provided no formal comparisons of the Prohibition with the license systems of Massachusetts, but simply sought to show the part played by drink as a cause of crime regardless of legislative policy, they are pertinent to our subject. Indeed, they are of the greatest value to all students, because of Mr. Wright's high reputation and the scientific accuracy characterizing all his work. In stating his objects he said: "For years there have been, among the temperance reformers of this country and Europe, much argument and eloquence based upon the more or less casual and scattered observations of private individuals as to the nature and extent of the influence which intemperance exerts in the commission of crime. The logic which the temperance advocate stands most in need of is the solid strength of facts collected and collated in a thorough and systematic manner within limits circumscribed as to time and territory. This investigation was inaugurated and conducted in the interest of all who are a prey to the sin of intemperance, but more especially in the interest of the youth of our State, with the ardent hope of revealing to them, stripped of prejudice and sentiment, the naked proportions of an evil prolific in poverty and prodigality, the expense of which, while a burden to all classes, falls in a greater degree on the workers and chief consumers of society." His conclusions were thus summarized: "These figures paint a picture, at once the most faithful and hideous, of the guilt and power of rum. Men and women, the young, the middle-aged and old, father and son, husband and wife, native and foreign-born, the night-walker and manslayer, the thief and adulterer,—all testify to its ramified and revolting tyranny. Therefore the result of this investigation, in view of the disproportionate magnitude of the exclusively rum offenses, and considered in connection with the notorious tendency of liquor to inflame and enlarge the passions and appetites, to import chaos into the moral and physical life, to level the barriers of decency and self-respect and to transport its victims into an abnormal and irresponsible state, destructive and degrading, calls for earnest and immediate attention at the bar of the public opinion and the public conscience of Massachusetts."

Mr. Wright first made a complete classification of all the sentences in Massachusetts for the 20 years 1860–79. He found that these sentences aggregated 578,458. He then selected, from the list of offenses, those which "belonged to rum absolutely" and obtained the following figures: Common drunkard, 21,859; drunkenness, 271,482; liquor-selling, 12,240; liquor-keeping, 26,423; liquor-carrying, 636; liquor nuisance, 8,174—total "sentences for rum crimes," 340,814, or about 59 per cent. of the sentences for all offenses. There remained 41 per cent. of the commitments which were for offenses that could not be absolutely attributed to drink, and the problem before Mr. Wright was to ascertain, if possible, what proportion of them should be added to the 59 per cent. of "distinctively rum offenses" as to which there could be no question.

He set about the solution of this problem by undertaking a most painstaking analysis of the commitments in the county of Suffolk (containing the city of Boston) for the year running from Sept. 1, 1879, to Sept. 1, 1880. Here he found that 12,289 of the 16,897 commitments, or 72 + per cent., were for rum offenses, leaving 4,608, or 27 + per cent., for other offenses. In order to determine how extensively drink was responsible for these 4,608 crimes he employed reliable agents to trace the history of each single case, to watch each trial and to personally interview all the offenders. The agents' reports were subjected to very careful supervision. Of the 4,608 criminals whose records were thus investigated, 2,097 were in liquor at the time of the commission of the offenses, 1,918 were in liquor at the time of the formation of the criminal intent, 1,804 had intemperate habits so marked as to induce a moral condition favorable to crime and 821 were led to a criminal condition through the contagion of intemperance. Taking the 2,097 cases in which the offenders were under the influence of liquor when they committed their offenses, and adding this number to the 12,289 "distinctively rum offenses," we see that 14,386 of the 16,897 commitments in Suffolk County during the year (or more than 84 per cent.) were due to drink peculiarly. This is the *minimum* number and the *minimum* percentage; for it can hardly be doubted that among the offenders not under the influence of liquor when their crimes were committed a considerable number had been brought to a criminal condition by former indulgence in liquor and by saloon associations.

The two investigations show a large disparity between the percentage of "distinctively rum offenses" in the State at large as compared with the percentage in the county of Suffolk: in the State at large the percentage was 59, and in Suffolk County 72. This difference incidentally illustrates the comparative success of Prohibition in Massachusetts in suppressing intemperance. The figures for the State at large cover a number of years in which Prohibition, in nearly the whole of the State, was well enforced; they also embrace many towns in which practically no liquor had been sold during that entire period of 20 years; and therefore the percentage of "distinctively rum offenses is a percentage obtained from totals of which the returns from Prohibition localities constitute a factor. The fact that this percentage is 13 less than the percentage of "rum offenses" in the wholly license county of Suffolk is in keeping with all the other teachings of Massachusetts statistics.

York passed an imperfect act in 1855, which was declared unconstitutional in certain parts in 1856 and repealed in 1857; it may be passed by with no other comment save the one made by Governor Clark in a message to the Legislature at the time, that it had been "subjected to an opposition more persistent, unscrupulous and defiant than is often incurred by an act of legislation; and though legal and magisterial influence, often acting unofficially and extra-judicially, have [had] combined to render it inoperative, to forestall the decision of the Courts, wrest the statute from its obvious meaning and create a general distrust, if not hostility to all legislative restrictions of the traffic, it has [had] still, outside of our large cities, been generally obeyed." "The influence is visible," added Governor Clark, "in a marked diminution of the evils it sought to remedy." The nominal Prohibitory laws of *Indiana* (1855–8), *Illinois* (1851–3), *Delaware* (1855–7) and *Nebraska* (1855–8), and the still less useful measures like the Adair law of *Ohio* (1854) that merely prohibited sales for consumption on the premises or embraced similar qualifications, encountered circumstances so disadvantageous as to deprive their results of significance; and they are entitled to remembrance chiefly because the fact of their enactment illustrates the favor shown Prohibition by the people and the fact of their speedy overthrow or comparative non-enforcement illustrates the truth that legislation does not vindicate or perpetuate itself automatically.

Local Option Prohibition.

Both reason and experience teach that, given a well-constructed law and local faithfulness to it, the success of Prohibition will be proportioned to the stability of the act and the extent of territory over which it is administered. We have seen that the enforcement of State Prohibition, even when operating throughout great commonwealths, is disturbed by conspirators at home and conspirators in neighboring States, parties to an illicit traffic which is most serious and hardest to repress at and near the boundary, and which (as indicated by the history of the "original package" period and by the situation in New Hampshire) becomes formidable with each relaxation or modification of the State's powers or radical attitude. Necessarily inferior are the fruits of the Local Option system, whose authority stops at a city's limits or a county's line, which rarely touches the manufacture and seldom places thorough restraint upon drug-store sales, whose practical enforcement provisions, moreover (including penalties, etc.), are not of local creation and in most cases cannot be made more stringent by the local government but are subject to the action of the State Legislature. Giving due attention to the limitations involved, it will be found, however, that even isolated Prohibition has conferred great benefits in numberless instances, and that, whenever executed with any semblance of fairness, it has done far better work for temperance, for morality and for the prevention of crime than has been done by any method of license. To fully show the results of Local Option Prohibition is impossible. There are countless localities for which no records are accessible; and in whole States, for long terms of years, no one has taken the pains to collect general evidence. Yet from the testimony at hand the workings of the policy in separate localities of every part of the country can be viewed, and in localities of nearly all grades of importance, from insignificant townships to populous cities, from the staid communities of New England to the lively towns of the West, from places peopled almost wholly by native white Americans to ones containing very large percentages of foreign-born citizens or negroes, from towns in which comparisons may be made with the loosest systems of license to those in which the most rigid High License and restrictive measures have been tried. Our examination of this testimony must be brief, but will be governed by the chief purpose of this article, to set forth the representative facts with a regard for detail sufficient to justify reasonable conclusions as to the general truth.

Massachusetts Cities.—Every city and town of Massachusetts votes each year on the question of granting liquor licenses. (See pp. 396–8.) A majority in the negative makes Prohibition of the sale obligatory for the ensuing license year. While four-fifths of the towns regularly refuse licenses nearly all the cities are fickle. There are certain ones, like Boston, that never decide for Prohibition, and others, like Somerville, Quincy and Malden, that never go against it. It is beyond question that the reliable "no-license" cities are the quietest and most creditably conducted ones in the State, that there is very little crime, pauperism or disorder in them and that they compare in all regards favorably with other places of like population and natural advantages. As an example: The city of Malden has always been under Prohibition; it has a large laboring class, adjoins the famous rum town of Medford, is only four miles from Boston and is traversed by two railroads. The city of Salem is about two-thirds larger than Malden (State Census of 1885), and has steadily adhered to license, having charged a High License fee of $500 in 1888 for the privilege of retailing all kinds of liquors for consumption off the premises; conditions are much the same as in Malden, the laboring element being large, although Salem lies on the sea-coast and is a less important railroad town than Malden. Manifestly Salem should be no worse off than Malden if it is true that High License is as good a temperance policy for cities as Prohibition. But during 1888 there were 1,162 arrests for drunkenness in Salem as against 132 in Malden; 1,540 arrests for all causes (of which eleven-fifteenths were for drunkenness) as against 518 in Malden (of which only one-fourth were for drunkenness), in each of the six years ending with 1888 there had been in Salem an increase in arrests for drunkenness as compared with the next preceding year; Salem in 1888 employed 36 police officers and expended $37,800 for her police department, while Malden employed only 14 and expended but $14,752; and in the same years Salem gave lodgment to 894 tramps while Malden lodged only 174.[1] Another example: Quincy, which has not licensed the saloons since 1882, had only 55 arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct in the year ending Sept. 30, 1888; but the near license town of Randolph, having only one-fourth of Quincy's population, had 143 arrests for these offenses in the same time.[2]

Again, compare the statistics of paupers, homeless children, prisoners and convicts in the most faithful Prohibition cities and the most stubborn license cities. The State Census of 1885 was taken under the direction of one of the most conscientious and respected statisticians of the country, Hon. Carroll D. Wright. As representative Prohibition cities take Malden, Somerville and Quincy, with an aggregate population of 58,523 in 1885, and as characteristic license cities take Salem, Newburyport and Northampton, with a total population of 54,702 in the same year. All the figures in the following table are from Mr. Wright's Census of 1885.

CITIES.	POPULATION.	PAUPERS.	HOMELESS CHILDREN.	PRISONERS AND CONVICTS.[1]
Prohibition:				
Malden	16,407	18	11	None
Somerville ...	29,971	6	7	"
Quincy	12,145	23	10	"
License:				
Salem........	28,090	125	157	42
Newburyport.	13,716	51	15	14
Northampton	12,896	448	91	21
Totals:				
Proh. Cities..	58,523	47	28	None
License " ..	54,702	624	263	77

[1] The figures under this head include persons awaiting trial, persons serving out fines and convicts under sentence at the time of taking the Census.

It is in cities like Worcester, Springfield and Lawrence, in which no-license has not been a permanent policy but has been unexpectedly adopted and speedily reversed, that Prohibition has operated under the worst embarrassments. Here are communities whose normal method is license; suddenly, at the city election, a change is made to no-license; at the same time the newly-chosen municipal officers may not be and are not likely to be cordial supporters of Prohibition; the conservative citizens look with coldness and distrust upon the novel programme; there is a prevailing belief that the enforcement will be passive and that the saloons will gather their forces and renew the license system at the end of one year; the manufacturers and wholesalers of liquor in other cities are actively interested in enabling the local retailers to successfully violate the law in the interval. If under such circumstances Prohibition has beneficial effects the fact must certainly be pronounced encouraging. The comparisons given below prove that even this least promising form of Prohibition does work for good, positively and conspicuously, and, it seems, uniformly.

---

[1] Political Prohibitionist for 1889, p. 58. [2] Ibid.

Worcester, from May 1, 1886, to May 1, 1887, was under Prohibition; from May 1, 1887, to May 1, 1888, under low license, and from May 1, 1888, to May 1, 1889, under High License. "The Political Prohibitionist for 1889" (p. 57) thus summarizes certain comparative facts and figures published by Rev. D. O. Mears, a prominent clergyman of Worcester: "During the Prohibition year there were 1,682 arrests for drunkenness; during the low license year, 3,549, and during the first six months of the High License year, 1,763. Thus in six months of High License there were 81 more arrests for drunkenness than during 12 months of Prohibition, and only 12 fewer than one-half of the whole number of arrests for drunkenness during 12 months of low license. The arrests were so numerous under High License in Worcester that the Worcester jail was not large enough to accommodate the prisoners, and during the seven months ending Nov. 1, 1888, 153 prisoners were transferred to the jail at Fitchburg, where, under Prohibition, there were ample accommodations. Even then Worcester's jail was overcrowded and it was necessary to discharge 300 prisoners to make room for the great numbers of offenders manufactured by the High License saloons."[1] The Hon. George F. Hoar, Senator of the United States from Massachusetts, is a citizen of Worcester, and at a public meeting he made the following remarks upon the increase in arrests since the abandonment of Prohibition:

> "This meeting has been called to hear the report and opinion of some of our friends who have had especial opportunity to observe the comparative effects of what is known as the High License system, and of the no-license system, upon the morals and good manners of our beloved city. . . . You know what the meaning of the increase in drunkenness is to a city. Twice the number of murders, twice the number of thefts, twice the number of paupers, twice the number of all kinds of sin and misery. Girls growing up to lives of vice, and young men to lives of crime, all because of the sins of the head of the family. That is what the figures of our increased number of arrests since the no-license year of 1886 mean to the city and to us."

Lawrence, for the year ending May 1, 1889, had Prohibition, and after that date was under High License (the fee being $1,000 for the sale of all liquors for consumption on the premises). The following are comparisons:

	1888, *Prohibition.*	1889, *High License.*
Convictions for drunkenness, May 1 to Nov. 1.....	246	747
Intoxicated persons helped home by police, May 1 to Nov. 1................	41	85
Women arrested for drunkenness, May 1 to Nov. 1..	57	118

In *Springfield* Prohibition was the law for the year beginning May 1, 1887, license ($400) for the year beginning May 1, 1888 and High License ($1,000) for the year beginning May 1, 1889. The arrests for all offenses and for drunkenness during the first four months of each year were as follows:[2]

	May 1 to Sept. 1.		
Arrests.	1887, *Prohibition.*	1888, $400 *License.*	1889, $1,000 *License.*
For all offenses...	408	879	845
" drunkenness..	237	609	561

"Drunkenness," said the Springfield *Homestead* in 1888, "is increasing at a fearful rate, as it always does under the license system. The new jail, which was thought to be enormous when it was built (1887), is already full to overflowing, and nine out of every ten men there were confessedly taken there by rum. This is not sentimental temperance talk but dry, solid fact."[3]

New Bedford, like Springfield, had Prohibition during the year beginning May 1, 1887, low license (an average of $230) the next year and High License ($1,100) the next year. The following are police figures for the first four months of each license year:[4]

	May 1 to Sept. 1.		
Arrests.	1887, *Prohibition.*	1888, $230 *License.*	1889, $1,100 *License.*
All offenses..	341	474	551
Drunkenness	182	336	316
Disorderly (assault and battery and disturbing the peace).	57	65	99

Cambridge, the seat of Harvard University, seems to have taken a place with the permanent no-license cities of the State, having voted against license for five years successively (beginning with 1886), although in the five preceding years it voted invariably for license; the temptations of the High License bribe, which proved irresistible in many cities in 1888, 1889 and 1890 did not cause Cambridge to waver. This city lies just on the outskirts of Boston, its interests are identical with those of the capital and large numbers of its people are employed there, but on the license question it is diametrically opposed to Boston. What is it that has induced Cambridge to maintain its brave stand for Prohibition? Certainly nothing else than the demonstrated benefits of this policy. The arrests for crime in the city decreased from 1,567 in 1886 (11 months) to 1,391 in 1889, while in 11 months of 1889 only 308 tramps were accommodated in the police stations as against 986 in the last year of license.[5] "The effect of no-license in Cambridge the last two years," said the Boston *Daily Traveller* in December, 1888, "may be gleaned from the following: The Police Captain says that District No. 2 has not been so quiet since he has been on the force. There have been Sundays in which there was not one arrest, something not experienced before in many years. The number imprisoned in the stations has fallen off one-fourth. Complaints which used to occupy four pages now take less than one. There are not one-tenth of the men going to Boston for liquor that went last year."

---

[1] These Worcester figures in each case run from the beginning of the license year (May 1). The police year ends Nov. 30. The year beginning with May 1, 1890, was another Prohibition year, and again there was a marked decrease in arrests for crime and drunkenness. We have statistics for the police years 1888, 1889 and 1890 (ending Nov. 30), as follows: Total arrests 1888 (entirely under license), 4,241; 1889 (entirely under license), 3,949; 1890 (seven months under Prohibition), 3,011. Arrests for drunkenness—1888 (entirely under license), 3,216; 1889 (entirely under license), 2,954; 1890 (seven months of Prohibition), 2,054. (For other figures see the *Voice*, Jan. 1, 1891.)

[2] The *Voice*, Oct. 31, 1889.

[3] Political Prohibitionist for 1889, p. 57.

[4] The *Voice*, Oct. 31, 1889.

[5] Ibid, Dec. 12, 1889.

Lowell, a great manufacturing center, very much to the surprise of most of its inhabitants, voted for Prohibition in December, 1889, and during the succeeding license year (beginning with May 1) it was under Prohibition; for many years previously it had been uniformly under license. Figures for the police years 1888, 1889 and 1890 (ending with Nov. 30) are as follows: [1]

Years, Ending Nov. 30.	License Fee.	No. of Saloons.	Total Arrests.	Arrests for Drunkenness.
1888	$500	217	4,150	2,930
1889	1,300	64	4,557	3,307
1890[1]	....	....	3,846	2,638

[1] Seven months under Prohibition, five months under $1,300 license.

Fall River, another very important manufacturing city, with an enormous population of working people, also had Prohibition from the 1st of May, 1890. The police records give the following showing: [2]

Years, Ending Nov. 30.	License Fee.	No. of Saloons.	Total Arrests.	Arrests for Drunkenness.
1888	$1,000	260	2,372	1,348
1889	1,300	56	2,414	1.520
1890[1]	....	....	2,069	1.309

[1] Seven months under Prohibition, five months under $1,300 license.

Woburn, like Lowell and Fall River, began a Prohibition year with May 1, 1890, and had license the two preceding years. In this city the police year ends with Dec. 30, and therefore the figures for 1890 in the table below are not complete: [3]

Years, Ending Dec. 30.	License Fee.	No. of Saloons.	Total Arrests.	Arrests for Drunkenness.
1888	$300	62	450	252
1889	1,300	11	569	332
1890[1]	....	..	350	213

[1] Eleven months, of which seven months were Prohibition and four months $1,300 license.

Canada's Experience (Province of Ontario).—The extensive Prohibition of Canada has been secured under the Scott (Local Option) act. The first county in the Province of Ontario to establish the act throughout its territory was Halton (1881), and there was at once a fair decrease in commitments for drunkenness there. As late as 1884 Halton was the only Ontario county in which (as a whole) the act was in force. But during the next three years many other counties, in whole or in part, adopted it. In 1887 no less than 23 counties were wholly and nine others were partly under Prohibition; while 16 remained entirely under license. The following tables contrasting the numbers of commitments for drunkenness in 1884 and 1887 for each of the three classes of counties are taken from Government returns: [4]

Counties.	Com. for Drunkenness.		Counties.	Com. for Drunkenness.	
	1884, Entirely under License.	1887, Entirely under Prohibition.		1884, Entirely under License.	1887, Entirely under Prohibition.
Bruce	3	6	Ontario	1	None
Dufferin	1	3	Oxford	51	"
Elgin	82	25	Peterboro.	30	11
Huron	4	None	Renfrew	27	2
Kent	26	7	Simcoe	99	16
Lambton	105	38	Stormont. Dundas. Glengarry	9	4
Lanark	7	9			
Leeds Grenville	135	24			
Lenox Addington	20	8	Wellington	49	22
Norfolk	17	5	Totals	692	186
N'thumberland Durham.	26	6	Decrease.		506

Counties.	Com. for Drunkenness.		Counties.	Com. for Drunkenness.	
	1884, Entirely under License.	1887, Partly under Prohibition.		1884, Entirely under License.	1887, Partly under Prohibition.
Brant	58	112	Victoria Haliburton	20	2
Carleton	314	286			
Frontenac	75	108			
Lincoln	39	21			
Middlesex	445	404	Totals	967	941
Muskoka Parry Sound.	16	8	Decrease.		26

Counties.	Com. for Drunkenness.		Counties.	Com. for Drunkenness.	
	1884, Entirely under License.	1887, Entirely under License.		1884, Entirely under License.	1887, Entirely under License.
Algoma	15	85	Thunder Bay	705	148
Essex	103	45			
Grey	23	21	Waterloo	11	8
Halimand.	7	17	Welland	23	32
Hastings	50	51	Wentworth.	295	373
Nippissing	17	13			
Peel	10	8	York	1,661	2,166
Perth	14	12			
Prescott. Russell	None	None	Totals	2,980	2,999
P. E. County.	46	20	Increase.		19

---

[1] See the *Voice*, Dec. 18, 1890. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

[4] The *Voice*, Feb. 7, 1889.

Other Instances.—The evidence from Massachusetts and Canada is by far the most important, of a general kind, that has yet been gathered. Indeed, Massachusetts is the only State of the Union in which a systematic attempt has been made to exhibit the results of Local Option Prohibition. Avoiding the multiplicity of testimony for scattered localities we give under this head a few of the most vital of recent facts, selecting communities that are strictly representative and widely separated.

Atlanta, Ga.—This city voted for Prohibition in November, 1885, after a prolonged and exciting discussion. With a population of 37,409 in 1880 (16,330 being colored), which had increased rapidly, and in view of the circumstances under which the policy was introduced and tried, the experiment in the Georgia capital was watched with uncommon interest throughout the country. There is no other city of the South where so notable a test of Prohibition has been made. The system had excellent support, but the advantage was not altogether with its friends; seven months elapsed before it took effect, the manufacturing and wholesale trades continued, wine was sold at retail, and there was a "jug trade" or illicit traffic with neighboring cities. After Prohibition had been in force for 12 months the Atlanta *Daily Constitution* (the chief newspaper of the city, which had not advocated the measure) printed, June 21, 1887, an elaborate editorial article, impartially examining the results. Nearly the whole of it was devoted to a demonstration of the improved condition of the city commercially and socially; the information bearing upon these aspects will be noticed in our survey of the "Effects upon Commercial Prosperity." (See p. 544.) Concerning the operation of the law in reducing the evils of drink the *Constitution* said:

> "Prohibition in this city does prohibit. The law is observed as well as the law against carrying concealed weapons, gambling, theft, and other offenses of like character. If there had been as many people in favor of carrying concealed weapons, theft, gambling, etc., as there were in favor of the retail of ardent spirits 12 months ago, law against these things would not have been carried out as well as it was against the liquor trade. In consideration of the small majority with which Prohibition was carried, and the large number of people who were opposed to seeing it prohibit, the law has been marvelously well observed....
>
> "The determination on the part of the people to prohibit the liquor traffic has stimulated a disposition to do away with other evils. The laws against gambling are rigidly enforced. A considerable stock of gamblers' tools gathered together by the police for several years past was recently used for the purpose of making a large bonfire on one of the unoccupied squares of the city. The City Council has refused longer to grant licenses to bucket-shops, thus putting the seal of its condemnation upon the trade in futures of all kinds.
>
> "All these reforms have had a decided tendency to diminish crime. Two weeks were necessary formerly to get through with the criminal docket. During the present year it was closed out in two days. The chain-gang is almost left with nothing but the chains and the balls. The gang part would not be large enough to work the public roads of the county were it not augmented by fresh supplies from the surrounding counties. The City Government is in the hands of our best citizens. . . . There is very little drinking in the city. There has been 40 per cent. falling off in the number of arrests, notwithstanding there has been a rigid interpretation of the law under which arrests are made. Formerly, if a man was sober enough to walk home he was not molested. Now, if there is the slightest variation from that state in which the center of gravity falls in a line inside the base, the party is made to answer for such variation at the station-house."

The *Sunny South*, another representative journal of Atlanta, said, June 11, 1887:

> "The annals of history will never perhaps contain a more wonderful revolution than that of Prohibition in Atlanta. When the issue was first joined the advocates of the liquor traffic declared that Prohibition could never be carried in a city of the size of Atlanta, and if carried could never be enforced. Many advocated High License, and some the substitution of wine for whiskey and brandy. No law has ever been more vigorously fought than Prohibition has been in Atlanta. Every artifice and scheme has been resorted to to nullify the operations of the law. The Courts have been tried. The provisions of the Prohibitory law exempting licenses from being terminated before they expired were used to defeat the law, as well as that allowing the sale of domestic wine. A great parade was made of liquor being brought in the city in jugs in order to throw odium upon the law. But Prohibition is not a failure in Atlanta, as the records show. The Courts have sustained it. Drinking has been cut off 80 per cent. The arrests for drunkenness have been largely reduced, and it only requires one policeman to guard 1,000 inhabitants. One hundred and thirty barrooms, vending on an average 13,000 drinks daily, have been wiped out. Families that during the prevalence of the liquor traffic suffered for the necessaries of life because their means were squandered for liquor, are now enabled to supply their wants from the money saved by Prohibition."

When the question of repealing the act came up in the fall of 1887 the citizens most prominent for character, public spirit and ability were all but unanimous in opposing repeal. Their objections were based upon no sentimental considerations or mere partisanship but upon the great good that Prohibition had accomplished. Their principal spokesman was the brilliant young orator, Henry W. Grady, whose reputation had spread throughout the Union, and who, as a man before whom political opportunities seemed to be opening, could certainly not have afforded to champion an unpopular cause unless its righteousness was undeniable. In 1885 Mr. Grady had doubted the expediency of Prohibition and had favored High License. But he now made an independent study of the condition of the city and found that it had been blessed in all ways by this law. He delivered a series of thrilling addresses, perhaps the most famous speeches ever made in advocacy of the policy of Prohibition by a public man not specially identified with the movement. The strength of his pleas was in the proofs that he gave of the better condition of the poor and the absolute failure of all predictions that the prosperity of Atlanta would be injured. Therefore quotations from them are reserved for the second division of this article, under the head, "Benefits to the Wage-Workers and the Poor." But Mr. Grady bore emphatic testimony to the diminution of criminal convictions. He showed from the records that there had been a steady increase in the number of convictions during the license years, but that the number had decreased to a marked extent under partial enforcement of Prohibition. "There was scarcely a case of vagrancy for a year past," said he. The returns for nine months of the last year of Prohibition, compared with nine months of the year of High License following it (fees of $1,000 for the sale of all liquors and $100 for the sale of beer only being charged), are as follows: Total arrests—first nine months of 1887 (Prohibition), 4,524; first nine months of 1888 (High License), 5,805. Arrests for drunkenness—first nine months of 1887, 674; first nine months of 1888, 1,519. The total arrests for the whole of the year 1885 (low license) were 6,305; for the whole of the year 1887 (Prohibition), 6,138;[1] for the whole of the year 1888 (High License), 7,817.[2]

Raleigh, the capital of North Carolina, with a negro element proportionately even larger than Atlanta's, had local Prohibition during the two years beginning with 1886. In 1888 High License was substituted for that system, and after a few months' trial of the new law the Raleigh *Spirit of the Age* said:

> "What is the consequence? No pen can answer that question save the pen of the recording angel, for God only knows the fearful result of the reopening of the barrooms. Is there more drunkenness now than during Prohibition? At least five times as much; and commensurate with the increase of drinking and drunkenness is the increase of wickedness and crime. The daily arrests by our policemen will give any man who wants the information an idea of what the dramshops are doing."

The other newspapers of Raleigh printed from time to time facts in keeping with these statements. For example, in the month of March, 1889 (High License), there were 103 arrests for all causes as against 53 in the same month of 1888 (Prohibition), 50 arrests for "drunk and disorderly," "drunk and down" and "drunk on the street" as against 12 in 1888, 10 arrests for "affrays" as against 2 in 1888, etc.[3]

Charleston, the capital of West Virginia, had low license ($300), Prohibition, and High License ($850), respectively, in the years ending in 1886, 1887 and 1888. The total arrests for the three years were: 1886 (low license), 423; 1887 (Prohibition), 226; 1888 (High License), 496.[4]

Rockford, Ill., presents an equally acceptable basis for comparisons. In the year beginning June 1, 1887, the license fee was $1,000, and in the next year the sale was prohibited. The total arrests for the first seven months of the license year 1887–8 (High License) were 309, for the same months of 1888–9 (Prohibition), 157; arrests for drunkenness in the same months of 1887–8, 210, as against 110 in the same months of 1888–9. The following are statistics for each license year from June 1, 1879 to June 1, 1888, inclusive:[5]

YEARS ENDING JUNE 1.	LICENSE FEE.	NO. OF SALOONS.	DRUNK AND DISORDERLY.
1879	$250	24	150
1880	Prohibition.	Prohibition.	124
1881	Prohibition.	Prohibition.	117
1882	500	23	348
1883	500	23	414
1884	600	25	338
1885	600	24	362
1886	600	24	243
1887	600	26	305
1888	1,000	25	843

Local Prohibition has numerous forms not strictly classifiable under the term "Local Option Prohibition." In many places the "option" principle has never been recognized, outright and permanent Prohibition having been prescribed by original settlers or controlling landowners, and subsequent purchasers of property having been bound by the conditions of title-deeds not to permit liquor-selling. In other places, not anchored to Prohibition by such arbitrary restrictions, the citizens have been wise, virtuous and persevering enough to adhere steadily to the policy after witnessing its advantages, and thus the "option" is never exercised; such places are the thriving cities of *Malden*, *Somerville* and *Quincy* in Massachusetts (see p. 531), and *Vineland*, *Millville* and *Bridgeton* in New Jersey. In another class of cities and towns the normal method is license, but the sale is absolutely prohibited on Sundays, on holidays and in times of emergency.

Greeley, Col., is a flourishing Western town in a region supposed to be filled with cowboys and other lawless people. In 1886 it had a population of about 2,500. Its county (Weld) contained 10,000 people, and neither in the town nor in the county was there a single pauper. Prohibition had been the law without interruption for many years. A prominent citizen of Greeley wrote as follows in the *Voice* for Nov. 18, 1886:

---

[1] As is shown above, the total number of arrests in the first nine months of 1887 was 4,524, so that in the last three months there were 1,614, a disproportionately large number as compared with the preceding months of this Prohibition year. The explanation is that in the repeal campaign, which was waged with great vigor in October and November, liquor was unscrupulously smuggled in by the rum element and dealt out liberally to the low classes with the double purpose of discrediting the law and bribing the voters, and that after the election (which came in the end of November) the rumsellers took possession of the town and sold boldly. At Christmas time there was a fearful outburst of intemperance, disorder and crime. "The prison van ran hither and thither until the wee hours of the Sabbath," said a daily press dispatch, Dec. 25, "carrying each time full complements of men and women, whites and blacks, who were unceremoniously piled into the grated conveyance, and as it bowled over the pavement profanity of the vilest type and songs of the most revolting kind issued through the iron-barred cages. At the pen, a close and confined apartment intended for the imprisonment of perhaps a score of offenders, the sight was one that carried with it but one suggestion—that of a den of hungry beasts howling for their customary allowance of food. Yelling, screaming and singing were indulged in by the drunken contingent as the hours rolled on, and the van being still out the roster received considerable accessions, more than 70 persons being corraled in all before morning. The police were kept busy to-day and the prisoners were joined by other delegations. Few were discharged, and to-night more recruits were recorded." (See the *Voice*, Dec. 29, 1887.)

[2] The *Voice*, Jan. 2, 1890.

[3] Political Prohibitionist for 1889, p. 59.

[4] In the two license years there were great revivals, influences helping to promote sobriety and diminish the business of the saloons. But in the Prohibition year there were no such helps to the temperance cause, and, besides, there were heated electoral campaigns and a very exciting session of the Legislature—conditions that did not exist in either of the license years.—*Political Prohibitionist* for 1889, p. 59.

[5] Political Prohibitionist for 1889, p. 58.

> "We have a $40,000 Court-house, and a fine jail—an ornamental appendage of the Court-house,—which has on an average only one occupant; and those who are imprisoned from time to time do not generally belong here, but are caught here while trying to hide away from justice. . . . From the City Clerk's office we learn that the expense of the Marshal for the city of Greeley for the year 1880 was $81.55; the number of arrests made, 7; the expense for Marshal in 1881 was $49 and the number of arrests, 5. The Marshal's expense for 1882 was $39.75, and the number of arrests, 4. In 1883 the Marshal was paid by the month at a salary of $40 per month. But this was regarded as a useless expense, and from that time on the Marshal has been paid only for the amount of work done. In 1884 the expense of the Marshal amounted to $238.55. This large expense was caused by the successful prosecution of a liquor case. The expenses for Marshal in 1885 were only $83. On several occasions persons have attempted to sell liquor on the sly, but they have been speedily detected, arrested and fined to the full extent of the law."

Pullman, Ill.—The foundations of this city were laid in May, 1880, and the first family moved there in January, 1881. In October, 1890, it had a population of about 11,000. It owes its existence and prosperity to the Pullman Palace Car Company. Mr. Pullman chose the site and bought all the land (4,000 acres). Extensive car-works were erected and cottages were built for the accommodation of the workmen. It is strictly a manufacturing and wage-earners' city: in 1890 5,250 persons were employed as operatives in the industries; many of these, however, were residents of neighboring towns, for, besides the 11,000 inhabitants of Pullman, there were 10,000 more people within a mile of its railroad depot. In the title-deeds to all the property, from the beginning, have been clauses absolutely prohibiting the liquor traffic, and it is universally admitted that this provision has given its humble people the remarkably fortunate conditions of life that they enjoy. In 1890 not more than 200 children were employed in the shops, a wonderfully small number in a city of which nearly all the male adults are day-laborers. There were only five physicians living within its limits to serve the 11,000 people. The death-rate has never been in excess of 11 per 1,000 per annum, about one-half the average death-rate for American cities. Only two policemen were needed to keep order, and these were detailed from the Chicago force; for in the absence of saloons it is unnecessary to maintain a police department. Yet license towns are not far distant, and Pullman is embraced within the 34th Ward of the great rum city of Chicago; so that the effectiveness of local Prohibition, even here, is counteracted to a certain extent.[1]

The experience of all other long-established and strict temperance towns, from the smallest to the largest, simply repeats the evidence that we have given. Permanent Prohibition by title-deeds or by ordinance is rapidly gaining popularity among men of sound business judgment as well as those of humane instincts. In mining centers like the new city of *Harriman* (Tenn.) and others of the South, in seaside resorts like *Asbury Park* and *Ocean Grove* (N. J.), in the popular mountain towns of Maryland, in such California communities as *Pasadena* and *Riverside*, the results are always the same—the worst public evils are hardly known if the drink business is not present, or vanish with its disappearance.

England, having no other reliable means of procuring complete local Prohibition than the authority of proprietors, has utilized this means in a great many places. The large town of *Saltaire*, near the city of Bradford, resembles Pullman in its conditions; it is devoted to manufacturing and most of its inhabitants are workingmen. The sale of liquors is totally prohibited. Mr. James Hole, in his "Homes of the Working Classes," says:

> "There are scarcely ever any arrears of rent. Infant mortality is very low as compared with that of Bradford, from which place the majority of the hands have come. Illegitimate births are rare. The tone and self-respect of the work-people are much greater than that of factory hands generally. Their wages are not high, but they enable them to secure more of the comforts and decencies of life than they could elsewhere, owing to the facilities placed within their reach, and the absence of drinking-houses."

In the *Province of Canterbury* more than a thousand parishes are wholly free from public houses and beer-shops, and in 1869 the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation of that Province made a report declaring that "in consequence of the absence of these inducements to crime and pauperism, according to the evidence before the Committee, the intelligence, morality and comfort of the people are such as the friends of temperance would have anticipated." Appended to the report were detailed answers from 243 clergymen and 11 Chief Constables and Superintendents of Police, in which appeared frequent statements like the following: "No public house, no beer-shop—no crime;" "No public house, no beer-shop—no intemperance;" "In parishes where there are neither public houses nor beer-shops the absence of crime is remarkable."[2] All candid Englishmen, when confronted with information as to the actual effects of Prohibition by landlords, have admitted its exceeding benefits. The Artisans, Laborers and General Dwellings' Company operates great estates, upon which are many thousands of residents, and has rigidly excluded all dramshops. At the opening of *Shaftesbury Park*, one of these estates, on July 18, 1874, Earl Shaftesbury presided and announced amid cheers that no public house would be permitted within its limits. The Prime Minister and eminent Conservative statesman, Benjamin Disraeli (Earl Beaconsfield) then said:

> "The experiment which you have made has succeeded and therefore can hardly be called an experiment; but in its success is involved the triumph of the social virtues, and the character of the great body of the people. . . . I see the possibility of attaining results which may guide the councils of the nation in the enterprise which I believe is impending in this country, on a great scale, of attempting to improve the dwellings of the great body of the people."[3]

Liverpool has populous districts under Prohibition, and the system works for the welfare of all, landlords and tenants, builders and investors, rich and poor, while the police have few or no duties to perform in the temperance quarters of that drink-cursed city.[1]

---

[1] Most of the facts here stated are taken from a descriptive circular issued, Oct. 14, 1890, by Duane Doty, editor of the Pullman *Arcade Journal*.

[2] Alcohol and the State, pp. 314–15.

[3] Local Option, by W. S. Caine, M. P., William Hoyle, F. S. S., and Rev. Dawson Burns, D. D. (London, 1885), p. 84.

As for the influence of Sunday and holiday Prohibition in license cities, it is invariably wholesome. This is seen in the almost complete application of the principle of Sunday-closing throughout the United States: it is recognized to be a good thing. Enforcement is not always rigid, but even a nominal closing of the saloons is found to be an advantage. Thorough enforcement never fails to have striking results. *New York City* has been forced to provide the Prohibition advocates with valuable comparisons. In 1866 a Metropolitan Excise law for New York and Brooklyn was passed, and for two years the police suppressed Sunday sales with tolerable rigor. The report of the Metropolitan Police Commissioners for 1867 showed that on eight Sundays in 1865 (under the old system) there were 1,078 arrests, and on the corresponding eight Sundays of 1867 (under Prohibition) there were 523; meanwhile on eight Tuesdays in 1865 the arrests aggregated 1,018, and in 1867 1,203.[2] The Massachusetts license law now prohibits liquor-selling on all holidays. In *Boston* this measure has brought a great reduction in the number of holiday arrests. On "Labor Day" (the first Monday of September) the total arrests in 1888 (saloons open) were 212 as against 78 in 1889 (saloons closed); arrests for drunkenness on this day, 179 in 1888 as against 58 in 1889; arrests of non-residents, 58 in 1888 as against 9 in 1889.[3] (For police returns for the period of Prohibition at the time of the Boston fire, see pp. 528–9.)

ECONOMIC AND OTHER EFFECTS.

The unprejudiced person must instinctively feel that a policy that so remarkably curtails intemperance, crime and pauperism, the most dreadful, wasting and humiliating evils of modern civilization, is presumably sound and beneficial from the economist's point of view. If under such a policy fewer individuals destroy their health, character and happiness, squander their means and impoverish and disgrace their families; if violence, indecency and graver wrongs, offenses against the person, against property and against the State, are always lessened under fairly executed Prohibition and often put practically to an end; if the occupations of the criminal, the policeman, the shyster and the jailer become less important, it is hard to understand how the policy can fail to do good on economic as well as on moral and social grounds. It is recognized, of course, that certain deprivations must ensue from it; individuals are made to sacrifice indulgences which by many are thought to contribute to the charms of life; particular kinds of opportunities for trade and gain are necessarily shut, and the visible revenues of the Government from various sources are checked. But it is capable of demonstration that, assuming that the drink traffic could be wholly exterminated, all these deprivations would be more than balanced by resulting advantages. The merits of this conditional proposition are considered in other articles, especially COST OF THE DRINK TRAFFIC and PERSONAL LIBERTY. The teachings of actual experience will now be examined.

Effects upon Commercial Prosperity.

The license advocates have no more aggressive argument against Prohibition than that it will injure the general interests of trade. But if this argument is viewed apart from all evidence, simply with a desire to see upon what fundamental principles it is based, we shall find it difficult to think that the assumption of the license theorists is more reasonable than the assumption of the Prohibition theorists. On the one hand license causes a single line of trade, the liquor traffic, to flourish, and incidentally keeps a few allied industries—like the malting and bottling—afloat, while it brings some business to certain other merchants; on the other hand it prevents consumption of and therefore demand for the necessaries and luxuries, and the degree of this prevention is known by all to be appalling. Contrast the commercial advantages of license with its commercial disadvantages (aside from all questions as to the possibility of carrying out Prohibition if secured), and few will be disposed to claim that the former are superior. The fact that trade enjoys wonderful and increasing prosperity in license cities is misleading if used to assert that fortunate trade conditions exist because of license or would be impaired if the license policy were ended. Such an assertion resembles the opinion of the self-satisfied manufacturer or farmer, who, having prospered by sticking to the methods of his ancestors, discards new devices without studying them, on the principle that it is wisest to "let well enough alone." Therefore no intelligent plea against Prohibition on commercial grounds can be founded on the encouraging general aspects of business under the license system. The development of trade depends upon natural and acquired facilities (the inducements to enterprise), and upon enterprise. The great cities are the centers of trade development, not because they nourish saloons but because they enjoy facilities and enterprise. At best neither license nor Prohibition can have more than an incidental influence for the stimulating or crippling of industries. Predictions as to the tendency of Prohibition's influence are unprofitable in localities that have not made the test. The truth must be sought in those places where Prohibition has been on trial; and invariably it disproves the claims of the alarmists.

---

[1] See "Alcohol and the State," pp. 322–4. [2] Ibid, p. 332.

[3] The *Voice*, Sept. 12, 1889.

The testimony runs parallel with that which we have given concerning the effects of this system upon the consumption of drink, upon crime, etc. Indeed in preparing the preceding pages it was in nearly all cases necessary, in order to confine ourselves to the features of the subject there discussed, to pass over a great deal of evidence pertinent to the present topic. Commendation of Prohibition as a temperance measure carries with it the positive declaration that no harm is done to the material interests of the people but that it reflects benefits upon all legitimate trades.

Maine, it is asserted by those best qualified to express opinions, was a very poor State when the liquor traffic was licensed, but has thrived under Prohibition. Neal Dow says that the law now annually saves to the people of the State (directly and indirectly) $20,000,000. (See p. 412.) If it is assumed that no liquor is now consumed in Maine the reasonableness of this estimate can scarcely be questioned, for in that case it would represent a yearly saving per inhabitant of only $30, and that sum is about the average yearly per capita expenditure (direct and indirect) caused by the traffic in the United States at large, if total abstainers and persons living in Prohibition localities are counted in making calculations for the country as a whole. But if it is supposed that the per capita direct and indirect expenditure in Maine is as much as $15—and this is merely an assumption for the sake of argument, not an admission,—the total annual saving is at least $10,000,000.

James G. Blaine, in a speech at Farmington, Me., in September, 1888, said:

> "Maine for the last 37 years has been under a Prohibitory law. I think the State has derived great advantage from it. I think that the State is far richer and far better because of the law than it would have been without it."[1]

"The State has been growing richer every year," wrote Senator Frye in 1890; "I believe I am entirely safe in saying there is no State in the Union enjoying more general prosperity than is to be found in Maine. There has been no depreciation of property; on the contrary, a general appreciation. I do not believe a respectable emigrant from the State of Maine can be found who will admit that he left the State because Prohibition prevailed there." "The material interests of Maine," wrote ex-Governor Sidney Perham at the same time, "have had a steady and healthy growth, and no other law has contributed so much toward this result as the Prohibitory law. Under it the business of the rumseller has suffered, while every legitimate interest has been benefited. The suppression of his business has secured to the people more means to purchase what is essential to comfortable living, thus increasing other and more desirable branches of trade." Joseph A. Locke, ex-President of the State Senate of Maine, wrote: "The good results arising from Prohibition can be readily seen by any unprejudiced person who will travel throughout our State and observe the general prosperity and happiness of our people, especially so should he take a team and ride through suburban villages and the country. The allegation that people are leaving the State to escape the 'blight of Prohibition' is all bosh."[2] "In my opinion," wrote John Ayer, President of the Somerset Railway, "the Prohibitory liquor law has done great good in this State. The general business depression is affected favorably by the Prohibitory law and made less than it would be but for this law."[3]

The following are statements from Maine bankers:[4]

John G. Brooks, President Belfast National

---

[1] Political Prohibitionist for 1889, p. 55.

[2] The *Voice*, Oct. 9, 1890. [3] Ibid, Oct. 16, 1890. [4] Ibid.

Bank, Belfast: "Prohibition of the liquor traffic is not detrimental to the business interests of our city. . . . The partial suppression of the sale of liquors has caused the saving of much money for legitimate business that would otherwise have gone to the saloons. Our people to-day dress better, have more of the comforts of life and have better homes than before the passage of the law. More business is now done than there was 10 or 20 years ago. The deposits in our banks have increased every year for the past 10 years, showing that the people have more money to use for business purposes. In fine, the law has had a tendency to improve business rather than depress it."

Galen C. Moses, President 1st National Bank, Bath: "I do not believe any candid, fair business man in Maine will contend that Prohibition affects business unfavorably or in any way, except that when enforced its effect is excellent upon every industry where men are employed."

J. Dingley, Jr., President 1st National Bank, Auburn: "Prohibition's effect has been to keep our people sober and industrious, to give them homes, to feed and clothe their children, to make them better citizens and to help build up our industries, which has been done, that would not if liquor had been sold with us. We boast of having a city that does not sell intoxicants of any kind; business is first-class."

Thomas C. Kennedy, President New Castle National Bank, New Castle: "More than nine-tenths of the business men of this county fully believe that Prohibition of the liquor traffic in this State is decidedly a great benefit to the business interests of the State."

In the Western States the high authorities from whom we have quoted so copiously on pp. 507–10 and 514–17 declare with the same emphasis that Prohibition has been no less successful in promoting the material welfare than in reducing the business of the Courts and emptying the prisons.

Kansas.—We summarize the testimony of some of the representative public men, and of fully trustworthy observers from other States.

John A. Martin, Governor of the State from 1885 to 1889, in a letter to the Associated Press, July 12, 1887: "During the past two years and a half I have organized 17 counties in the western section of the State, and Census-takers have been appointed for four other counties, leaving only two counties remaining to be organized. The cities and towns of Kansas, with hardly an exception, have kept pace in growth and prosperity with this marvelous development of the State. Many of them have doubled their population during the past year. And it is a remarkable fact that several cities and towns languished or stood still until they abolished their saloons, and from that date to the present time their growth and prosperity has equalled, and in some instances surpassed, that of other places with equal natural advantages. Summing up, the facts of the Census [State Census of 1886] confute and confound those who assert that the material prosperity of any community is promoted by the presence of saloons. So far as Kansas and all her cities and towns are concerned, the reverse of this assertion is true. The most wonderful era of prosperity, of material, moral and intellectual development, of growth in country, cities and towns ever witnessed on the American Continent has been illustrated in Kansas during the six years since the temperance Amendment to our Constitution was adopted, and especially during the past two years, the period of its most energetic and complete enforcement."

John J. Ingalls, United States Senator: "The prediction of its [Prohibition's] opponents has not been verified; immigration has not been repelled, nor has capital been diverted from the State. The period has been one of unexampled growth and development. Whether *post hoc* or *propter hoc*, coincidence or cause, is not material. The evils prophesied have not come to pass."[1]

M. Mohler, Secretary of the State Board of Agriculture: "The idea that Kansas has lost either in population or wealth because of Prohibition is simply preposterous, and in my judgment no one in his right mind really believes it. For every man we lose because of Prohibition we gain two better men because we have Prohibition." A State Census is taken each year in Kansas, and the following figures from the Census of 1889 were given by Secretary Mohler:[2]

	1880.	1889.	GAIN. PER CENT.
Population	996,096	1,464,914	47
Field Crops, Acres.	8,868,884	16,821,572	90
" " Value.	$63,111,634	$104,572,498	66
Live Stock, Value	$61,563,956	$116,126,466	89
All Farm Products, Value	$80.500.244	$147,434,383	83
Wealth	$160,570,761	$360,813,902	124
Manufactures, Capital Invested	$11,192,315	$29,016,760	159
Schools, No. of Districts	6,134	8,775	43
School Property, Value	$4,633,044	$8,608,202	86
Children of School Age	340,647	532,010	56
Churches	964	1,956	103
Church Property, Value	$2,430,385	$6,415,937	164

L. K. Kirk, President of the Board of Trustees of the Charitable Institutions of the State of Kansas: "There has been no backward step in either the moral, social or monetary condition of the State in the remotest degree attributable to Prohibition or its effects. On the other hand there has been vastly less drunkenness, and that will assure anyone that the moral, social and financial condition of the State is the better to that extent."[3]

D. M. Valentine, Associate-Justice of the State Supreme Court: "The State has vastly increased both in wealth and population, and the quality of both is probably very much better than it would have been if the State had been filled with liquor-saloons."[4]

---

[1] *Forum* Magazine for August, 1889.

[2] The *Voice*, Oct. 9, 1890.

For explanations of differences between the State Census of 1889 and the Federal Census of 1890, see p. 553.

[3] The *Voice*, Oct. 9, 1890. [4] Ibid.

W. A. Johnston, Associate-Justice of the State Supreme Court: "I say without hesitation that I believe that Prohibition has been of vast benefit to Kansas, and that its operation has greatly advanced the moral, social and financial condition of our people." [1]

D. W. Wilder, Superintendent of the State Insurance Department: "Kansas is very prosperous, gaining very fast in wealth and people. But her greatest gain has been in the abolition of saloons." [2]

William Sims, State Treasurer: "The loss to our business interests resulting from the removal of those heretofore engaged in the liquor traffic has been more than compensated for by the increase of legitimate business, and the immigration hither of those seeking homes where the open saloon is unknown; and no depression in value can, in my judgment, be traced, directly or indirectly, to the enforcement of Constitutional Prohibition." [3]

As is shown on pp. 508–9, the Probate Judges of the counties of Kansas, upon being asked whether "the loss of revenue from former saloon licenses" had been "more than made good by . . . the directing of the money formerly spent in the saloons now into legitimate channels of trade," answered almost unanimously in the affirmative.

The formal declaration issued in 1889 and signed, among others, by the Governor, the Secretary of State, the Auditor of State, the Treasurer of State, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Attorney-General, the Chief-Justice and two Associate-Justices of the Supreme Court, to which we have alluded on p. 509, embraced unqualified statements like the following:

> "In its practical operation the law promotes the welfare and prosperity of our citizens of all classes and conditions, especially of laboring men, and of all men who are struggling by honest work to maintain their families and educate their children. . . . In connection with other influences the contest successfully waged in this State against the saloon has increased our population, it has enlarged our wealth and it has powerfully advanced the material, educational and moral interests of our people. The State of Kansas is far more prosperous to-day than it ever has been at any former period in its history."

Fair-minded men at the East who have business investments in Kansas, or who have visited it for the purpose of ascertaining whether investment there was desirable or of investigating the results of the liquor law, all pronounce Prohibition a leading factor in advancing its prosperity. The Stockholders' Committee of the Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, which is under the direction of Eastern capitalists and deals extensively in Kansas farm mortgages, said in its annual report to the company in December, 1888:

> "Believing it to be a matter of financial interest and otherwise to our stockholders, we digress somewhat to treat upon a question which has been and is agitating the moral, social, religious and political welfare of all sections of our common country. We have no motive other than to apply the deductions therefrom obtained to the value of your Kansas investments. Noting the practical effects of Prohibition upon the people of the State, our observations lead us to believe that this movement is a grand success in Kansas, which adds, and will continue to add, value to all the lands in the State. Whatever makes human existence less burdensome, reduces taxation, prevents crime and destroys pauperism is sure to give tangible and material wealth to any State. . . . We look upon the above facts [concerning the success of Kansas Prohibition], vouched for by such high authority, as a strong argument in favor of loans in a State advancing so rapidly in moral as well as material progress." [4]

D. O. Bradley, a prominent banker of Tarrytown, N. Y., whose sympathies had always been with High License in preference to Prohibition, published a letter in the Tarrytown *Argus* in 1889 in which he said:

> "I have just returned from seven days spent in roaming over the State of Kansas, with a party of New York City bank officers who were delegates to the annual Bankers' National Convention which was held on Sept. 25 and 26 at Kansas City, Mo. We were entertained in various ways by the bank officers who lived at the towns which we visited. Topeka, Hutchinson and other cities made careful provision to welcome us. We were brought into contact with the leading business men of various localities, under the most favorable auspices. Our curiosity and interest in the matter tempted us everywhere to introduce the Prohibition question. The testimony was concurrent and unanimous . . . that the business men and property owners of the State are as thoroughly united in support of the Prohibitory law as on any other question of politics or morals. I heard many men in different localities talk, and all without exception were decisive and positive supporters of the present order of things. Polygamy and Mormonism could be introduced into the State as easily as the rum traffic. I have never entered better or more prosperous hotels, either in this country or in Europe, than I found all over Kansas. Their proprietors scouted the idea that the sale of liquors constituted in any way a legitimate part of their business. They all agreed that the Prohibitory law had given character, dignity and profit to their calling." [5]

L. A. Maynard, representing the New York *Observer*, went to Kansas in 1889 to make an impartial study of the Prohibitory law. "I have heard so much in the East about the way that Prohibition kills the towns," he wrote, "that I was quite prepared to find a lot of dead municipalities. . . . On the contrary I have found an amazing amount of life and vigor in these villages and cities that ought to be dead, according to the whiskey logic of the East: many of them growing so fast that it is as much as ever the mother government of the State can do to keep them properly dressed up in municipal clothes. I have met scores of persons, merchants, bankers and solid business men, who have told me that they were not in favor of Prohibition when the question was first submitted; they fought and voted against it, but now they say they would not be willing to take the saloon back again on any terms. They have become so thoroughly convinced of the good results of the law upon the business interests of the State, as well as upon other interests, that they stand openly and firmly in favor of its continuance." [6]

No attempt can here be made to quote from individual business men of Kansas: separate quotations would add little to the preceding opinions from the most responsible and representative sources, and our space is insufficient for such an elaborate review as would be necessary in undertaking a general presentation of private experience. Yet in private experience lies the final test of Prohibition's effects upon trade. It may be claimed that the politician merely echoes views that are most agreeable to him, and that public officials speak only for partisans who, while in the majority for the time being, may possibly be mistaken. Such a claim cannot by any reasonable process of judgment be suggested in qualification of the weighty declarations of Kansas public men: these declarations are too specific to be read with any tinge of distrust, and the facts sustaining them are too strong; besides (remembering that it is the rarest of things for public men to exaggerate the good of Prohibition), it would be nothing less than fantastic to assert that a Governor who opposed the law when it was enacted, a conservative United States Senator, the Chief-Justice and other Judges of the Supreme Court, the State Treasurer, the Secretary of State, the State Auditor, the Attorney-General, the Secretary of the State Board of Agriculture, the Superintendent of the Insurance Department and numerous other officials of every grade are all ignorant of the true commercial situation, or are engaged in a conspiracy to falsify the facts, or would dare praise the law on business grounds if the material interests of Kansas were really suffering in consequence of it. But the truth can be most significantly shown by inquiry among the men whose fortunes are staked in commercial enterprises. Their general opinion has been ascertained repeatedly, by the New York banker from whom we have quoted, by the *Observer's* correspondent, by the State authorities, and by various newspaper editors and others who have sent letters to representative business men throughout the State. The *Voice* in 1890 forwarded a large number of such letters, and the replies were favorable with few exceptions. Represented among those who answered encouragingly were four bankers of Topeka, real estate dealers, manufacturers and tradesmen of many avocations. A few of the responses were published by the *Voice* in its issue for Oct. 16, 1890.

---

[1] The *Voice*, Oct. 9, 1890. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid, Oct. 16, 1890.

[4] Political Prohibitionist for 1889, p. 51.

[5] The *Voice*, Oct. 24, 1889.

[6] Political Prohibitionist for 1889, pp. 48–9.

To sum up: The most cautious student must at least concede that, so far as Kansas is concerned, the statistical facts as well as the presumptions deduced from public and private assertion throw the burden of proof upon the opponents of Prohibition. It may be admitted that the evidence submitted is partial and that some public men esteemed reputable in Kansas, together with some honorable merchants, are not prepared to indorse it and even speak counter to it; but no important consensus of hostile opinion has been presented. Much has been said against the law by the Resubmissionists, who avow that they attack it for the sake of the State's prosperity; but there is a strong suggestion of intolerance and localism in their arguments, and it is not encouraging to find that their characteristic supporters among the masses are persons who desire to sell liquor, persons who desire freedom to drink it and persons of criminal or objectionable professions or tendencies. On the side of the law are distinctively ranged the best citizens, in opposition to it the worst ones: this contrast may not be decisive, but it must surely emphasize the belief that the burden of proof rests with the law's foes. No disturbance of judgment need be occasioned by the fact that an element of respectable business men may by diligent search be found associated with the opposition: a division of opinion concerning any policy of only ten years' standing is unavoidable. Tradesmen are always willing to think that their prosperity is not satisfactory, and it would be remarkable if the representations against Prohibition that are so industriously spread did not find some credence among merchants in Kansas. Tradesmen of particular kinds in particular towns have plausible reasons for discontent: they remember the lively times of years gone, forgetting that those were times of crudity and improvidence, which must have come to an end in any case, and that more substantial conditions have been evolved.

The testimony for *Iowa* is equally abundant and strong.

William Larrabee, Governor of the State from 1885 to 1889: "The assertion that Prohibition has been ruinous to the business interests of Iowa, and that real estate and values of other property are depressed, and that people are leaving the State to escape the 'blight of Prohibition,' is too absurd for notice. Iowa has never been more prosperous than now. The beneficial results of Prohibition are observable on every hand where the law has been enforced. Moral, intellectual and material welfare have been advanced."[1] "As to the depreciation of value of real estate occasioned by Prohibition, it is the sheerest nonsense. Values have, I believe, been sustained in Iowa as well as adjoining States where Prohibition is not the rule. The same causes that have affected values elsewhere have undoubtedly had their effect here. Crops grow, herds multiply and the markets of the world continue open to us the same as before, and why should business suffer? Money is now spent for the necessaries of life and for legitimate uses instead of being spent at the saloon. The banking business of a State is perhaps as fair a barometer of business as can be found. The number of banks in the State has increased from 186 in 1883 to 244 in 1888; deposits have increased from $27,231,719.74 to $39,935,362.68 in 1888."[2]

J. A. Lyons, Auditor of State: "It is my opinion the Prohibitory law of this State has not depreciated the value of real estate, but has promoted legitimate lines of business."[3]

Henry Sabine, State Superintendent of Public Instruction: "My official duties have taken me into every section of the State during the past summer. I have nowhere found any signs of blight or depression among our people. I have had especial occasion to note the condition of our educational institutions. There never was a time in the history of Iowa when our institutions of learning were as full of earnest, energetic young men and women as they are to-day. Our denominational colleges, our private schools and our State institutions without exception report an increased number of students. This could hardly be true if values were depressed and people leaving the State to escape the 'blight of Prohibition.'"[4]

M. Stalker, State Veterinary Surgeon: "Since the passage of the Prohibitory law in Iowa I have been in as many as 90 counties of the State in one summer. I have endeavored to note carefully and impartially the effects following the operation of this law. I was very doubtful of its results at the time of its passage. I am now of the opinion that the law has been and is now an incalculable benefit to the State, and that no material or other legitimate interest has suffered to the extent of a single penny, unless you choose to place the liquor traffic in that category. No man has left the State on account of this law without bringing up the moral average of the State he left."[5]

R. C. Webb, Superintendent of the Iowa State Agricultural Society: "As for our land depreciating in value that is a fearful mistake. Land in Iowa is as high in price as it ought to be for farming purposes. Land is from $25 to $100, and even up to $200. Our State is in a healthy condition, out of debt, and we stand in the front rank for education and Christianity. Money with us is plenty, and it is hard work to get 8 per cent. on loans, and many are loaning at 6 per cent. and glad to get it."[6]

E. H. Conger, Member of Congress: "In my home city, Des Moines, the population has doubled under it, property has continually appreciated and a considerable majority of our citizens are delighted with the operation of the law, and would strenuously and bitterly oppose its repeal. In a certain railroad town with which I am very familiar, when operating under the license system, it was with the greatest difficulty that merchants secured payment of their accounts at pay-day, but under Prohibition the cases of non-payment were rare indeed, and merchants easily collected the entire bills from these railroad employes. But on the very first pay-day after the 'original package' saloons were recently established, from one-third to one-half of the bills were left unpaid. Yet during the same month one vendor of 'original packages' in this town deposited over $1,100 of profits in bank."[7]

Specimen letters from Iowa business men themselves may be found in the *Voice* for Oct. 16, 1890. These represent a number of the cities which figure repeatedly in the highly-colored reports of Prohibition's hurtful effects. The President of the National Bank of Sioux City writes: "Our city has made a marvellous growth since the law was enacted, and while we do not attribute it all to the law, there is no question in my mind but a portion of our prosperity is due directly to the beneficial results of the law." "Five years ago," says the Secretary of the Board of Trade of Ottumwa, "we had three National banks whose combined deposits were about $600,000. These three banks have to-day about $800,000 on deposit. Some two years ago two savings-banks were started here, and their deposits now amount to nearly $300,000." A lumber merchant of Burlington expresses the opinion that "if the city has suffered for the lack of legitimate business it is because Prohibition has not been enforced." A wagon company of the same city declares that "there is no one living in Nebraska or in Burlington who can convince us that Prohibition of the liquor traffic is detrimental to our business." A Des Moines wholesale dealer in boots and shoes declares: "Many of our customers throughout the State have assured us that their trade in boots and shoes has been larger since the close of the saloons in their towns. We find collections better in Iowa than in any other Western State, excepting possibly Colorado." The postmaster of Muscatine remarks that "We people of Iowa know that the Prohibitory law is a blessing in the proportion that it is enforced." A Dubuque manufacturer of lard oil, soap and candles, testifies: "Instead of Prohibition having injured my business it has enabled me to double my business, and my per cent. of bad debts has decreased about one-half. I have carried on this business 30 years in this city, and my trade covers the northern half of the State. And I believe my experience is not different from that of other manufacturers in Iowa." "After 25 years' experience in business in this city I am convinced that Prohibition does not injure trade," writes a Des Moines jeweler. All the testimony so far presented by persons who have made impartial attempts to learn the general opinion of the Iowa tradespeople indicate that expressions like the foregoing are representative of the sentiment not only of a large majority but of the most intelligent and least prejudiced business men. It is undoubtedly true, however, that the judgment of Iowa as to the wholesome commercial consequences of the law is not so sweeping as that of Kansas. This is another illustration of the fact that Prohibitory laws are recognized as beneficial in proportion to the length of trial and the completeness of enforcement; for the system has been in force in Iowa only about half as many years as in Kansas, and the resistance to it has been more successful in the former State than in the latter. It is also instructive that the complaints of merchants against Prohibition are most numerous from those cities, like Council Bluffs, Dubuque, Davenport and Burlington, where the statute has been violated, while in places like Des Moines and Sioux City, where the most striking enforcement work has been done, the business men are least disposed to criticise.

---

[1] The *Voice*, Oct. 9, 1890.

[2] From a letter to Rev. William Fuller of Aberdeen, S. D., Feb. 16, 1889. (See the "Political Prohibitionist for 1889," p. 53.)

[3] The *Voice*, Oct. 9, 1890. [4] Ibid. [5] Ibid. [6] Ibid.

[7] Ibid.

The reader who has carefully followed this evidence, while probably admitting that the Prohibitionists have the better of the discussion so far as Maine, Kansas and Iowa are concerned, will recall the formidable list of States that have repealed Prohibition and the confident assertions so often made by saloon advocates that the injury inflicted upon the business community was everywhere a chief cause of repeal. Yet it is safe to say that no reader, however vivid his recollection of these assertions may be, can mention any specific proofs of them.

The case of *Rhode Island* is the most recent and is most frequently instanced by the anti-Prohibitionists. In that State many manufacturers and other business men in 1889 signed a declaration against the Prohibitory law. Stripped of explanations this circumstance may be thought damaging to the belief that Prohibition did no harm in Rhode Island. But the petitions for resubmission of the Constitutional Amendment had only about 5,000 signatures, while those against resubmission received more than 10,000.[1] Naturally the canvassers on both sides sought indorsements principally from persons of influence and respectability; and although it is probable that the anti-repeal petitions, being hastily prepared, did not contain so many prominent names as the petitions of the repealers, the much larger total number of signatures to the former deprives the argument based on business opposition to the law of all conclusiveness.

The reputable repealers objected not to Prohibition but to unenforced Prohibition. There had been no opportunity in the State for observing the effects of genuine Prohibition. Disgust had been excited by the scandalous unfaithfulness of some of the chief officials and by the political "deals" that had been perpetrated. The thousands of conservative men who either voted against the Amendment in 1886 or supported it with strong distrust now felt a keener prejudice, and many who had looked forward with confidence to the execution of the law were ready to advocate a change. But in the city of Providence the act had been partly enforced, and, as we have seen, the arrests for drunkenness and crime had been noticeably diminished. (See p. 525.) If it is true that the prosperity of Rhode Island was disturbed by any influences reasonably attributable to the Prohibition policy the years of the law's existence must have been bad years for general business in Providence. On the contrary they were uncommonly good years, as the following figures show:[2]

Bank Clearings in Providence.—For 1883

---

[1] Political Prohibitionist for 1889, p. 86.

[2] On the authority of Walter B. Frost of Providence. (See the *Voice*, March 7, 1889.)

(license), $237,148,800; 1884 (license), $217,448,300; 1885 (license), $216,465,200—net decrease in 1885 compared with 1883, $20,683,600. For 1886 (one-half Prohibition), $232,688,200; 1887 (Prohibition), $244,977,100; 1888 (Prohibition), $248,669,640—net increase in 1888 as compared with 1885 (the last year of license), $32,204,440.

Savings Bank Deposits (for the entire State).—In 1882 (license), $48,320,671.80; in 1885 (license), $51,816,390.42—increase in three years, $3,495,628.62, or 7.2 per cent. On Nov. 21, 1888 (Prohibition), $57,699,884.94—increase since 1885 (the last year of license), $5,883,494.52, or 11.4 per cent. The actual increase for the three years ending 1888 was 68 per cent. larger than the actual increase for the three years ending 1885 (the last year of license).

Total Valuation of Real Estate in Providence.—In 1885 (the last year of license), $92,887,400; in 1888, $100,915,860—increase, $8,028,460, or 8.6 per cent.

Total Valuation of Personal Property in Providence.—In 1885 (the last year of license), $31,314,600; in 1888, $35,837,840—increase, $3,523,240, or 11.2 per cent.

Without exception the reports that Prohibition has been abandoned in other States because of injury done to business either are designing misrepresentations or have absolutely no element of proof to sustain them.

The results under Local Option laws are equally cheering from the business point of view. We have not space for a detailed examination of various localities. The flourishing Southern city of *Atlanta*, it will be admitted, is typical of all the large and active communities where the policy has had a temporary trial. There can be no higher authority cited in reference to the trade affairs of Atlanta than the *Daily Constitution* of that city. In a careful editorial article (June 21, 1887) on the results of a year's trial of the Prohibitory law, the *Constitution* said:

"Prohibition has not injured the city financially. According to the Assessors' books, property in the city has increased over $2,000,000. Taxes have not been increased. Two streets in the city, Decatur and Peters, were known as liquor streets. It was hardly considered proper for a lady to walk these streets without an escort. Now they are just as orderly as any in the city. Property on them has advanced from 10 to 25 per cent. The loss of $40,000 revenue consequent on closing the saloons has tended in no degree to impede the city's progress in any direction. Large appropriations have been made to the water-works, the public schools, the Piedmont Fair and other improvements. The business men have raised $400,000 to build the Atlanta & Hawkinsville Railroad. The number of city banks is to be increased to five. The coming of four new railroads has been settled during the year. Fifteen new stores containing house-furnishing goods have been started since Prohibition went into effect. These are doing well. More furniture has been sold to mechanics and laboring men in the last 12 months than in any 12 months during the history of the city. The manufacturing establishments of the city have received new life. A glass factory has been built. A cotton seed oil mill is being built, worth $125,000. All improvement companies with a basis in real estate have seen their stock doubled in value since the election on Prohibition.

"Stores in which the liquor trade was conducted are not vacant, but are now occupied by other lines of trade. According to the real estate men more laborers and men of limited means are buying lots than ever before. Rents are more promptly paid than formerly. More houses are rented by the same number of families than heretofore. Before Prohibition, sometimes as many as three families would live in one house. The heads of those families not now spending their money for drink are each able to rent a house, thus using three instead of one. Workingmen who formerly spent a great part of their money for liquor now spend it in food and clothes for their families. The retail grocery men sell more goods and collect their bills better than ever before. Thus they are able to settle more promptly with the wholesale men.

"A perceptible increase has been noticed in the number of people who ride on the street cars. According to the coal-dealers many people bought coal and stored it away last winter who had never been known to do so before. Others who had been accustomed to buying two or three tons on time, this last winter bought seven or eight and paid cash for it. A leading proprietor of a millinery store said that he had sold more hats and bonnets to laboring men for their wives and daughters than before in the history of his business. Contractors say their men do better work, and on Saturday evenings, when they receive their week's wages, spend the same for flour, hams, drygoods, or other necessary things for their families. Thus they are in better spirits, have more hope, and are not inclined to strike and growl about higher wages."

Two months after Prohibition had taken effect in Atlanta Mr. M. M. Welch, Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, wrote a very thorough statement of the condition of the city. This was at a time when any ill effects of the system should have been especially noticeable, for the liquor traffic (which is said to be an ally to general trade) had just suffered complete paralysis and the city had not yet fully adjusted itself to the new order of things. Yet nine months had elapsed since the vote on Prohibition had been taken, and therefore there had been seven months of warning—a period long enough to have caused a marked depression if serious apprehensions were cherished. Secretary Welch said, in part:[1]

"There have been more new houses built in the city during the last 12 months than there are vacant houses of every description in the city at present, . . . and the number of vacant houses is not so great at present as it was one year ago. . . . Our manufacturers are all doing well, with good markets for their products, contented labor and constantly increasing capacity. . . . A review of the trade of the city for the year closing with the 1st of this month is very gratifying in its results, and the outlook for the ensuing year more encouraging than that of any preceding year within the history of the city. I am prepared to substantiate these general statements by reliable information collected from dealers, which shows a decided increase in the volume of trade during the year in every line of wholesale business except the grocery trade, and that has held its own, with a number of new houses opened during the year. There are special reasons that have operated against the wholesale grocery trade during the year, but in the face of this fact the volume of business has been equal to that of any preceding year.

"Every line of retail trade in this city shows an increase over any preceding year of from 10 to 25 per cent. and in some lines in excess of this amount. The increase in the retail grocery trade is especially notable for the year, while during the last 60 days [the exact period since Prohibition took effect—Ed.] it will amout to at least 30 per cent. in excess of a similar period during any preceding year. It is a fact, also, that this increase consists largely in the sale of fancy groceries. Patrons who formerly purchased for their families only plain corn meal and bacon now add to these substantials fancy goods, such as canned meats, sardines, canned fruits and vegetables, pickles, etc. There are evidences of a spirit of frugality springing up among the laboring classes. Some are leaving regularly on deposit, in the offices of their employers, a portion of their week's earnings, others investing in houses on the installment plan."

Henry W. Grady, in his celebrated speech during the Atlanta repeal campaign (November, 1887), exhaustively showed from the testimony of individual real estate dealers and other business men, as well as from official statistics, that the people were more prosperous than they had ever been. "What harm has it done?" said he. "They [the anti-Prohibitionists] said we were going to be ruined, that bats and owls would fly in and out, and the real estate men have the renting of nine out of ten houses that are rented. They testify without a break, absolutely without a break, that they have fewer houses on their lists than they have ever had since they have been in business. Two of them have advertised in the last few days for 100 houses, and to-day Mr. Tally told me that he actually left his office because he was bored by people who wanted to get somewhere to live in this town. Mr. Scott told me that he could put tenants in 500 houses in 30 days from to-morrow." (Further quotations from Mr. Grady, together with a summary of recent interesting correspondence with tradesmen, are given under the head of "Benefits to the Wage-Workers and the Poor.")

Effects upon Taxation and Population.

These effects of Prohibitory law are incidental to its relations to commercial prosperity, as those relations are to its moral and social influences. As we have said before, we cannot fully separate the different classes of effects, except arbitrarily: evidence upon one branch of the subject continually runs into evidence upon other branches. Thus frequent allusions to taxation and population are scattered through the testimony already introduced. In that remarkable series of letters from the Probate Judges of Kansas, as is pointed out on p. 108, reports from 90 of the 97 represented counties declared emphatically that the loss of the revenue from former saloon licenses had been "more than made good by the decreasing burdens of pauperism and crime resulting from Prohibition," etc. And the County Prosecuting Attorneys of Iowa answered similarly—49 of them in a total of 57 heard from. (See p. 515.) Such statements, if trustworthy, carry with them, of course, the implication that taxes, so far as they are affected by Prohibition, are made relatively less onerous; for the distinctive fiscal effect of the policy is to remove from the public treasury the liquor revenue, and if this revenue is "more than made good" by a decrease of certain public expenses nothing remains to be said touching the tax aspect of the question.

It is no unimportant thing to prove that the taxes laid upon the community in general do not necessarily become proportionately heavier with the relinquishment of license moneys and the complete or measurable destruction of a rich and widespread traffic. In both Kansas and Iowa tolorably high license charges prevailed when the Prohibitory statutes were adopted. The saloon revenue was a considerable factor of the public income in every town and county where licenses were granted. Each liquor establishment represented also a round sum of accumulated capital, which could be levied on at general tax rates so long as the business existed, but would probably be wiped out, or materially reduced, or taken to another State, upon the enforcement of Prohibition. Therefore the new legislation threatened each pro-license locality with an immediate loss of revenue large enough to perceptibly increase the tax-bills of all assessed people, unless a compensating diminution of expenditures should ensue. Recognition of the claim that such a diminution has ensued in Kansas and Iowa, and will probably ensue wherever Prohibition is well executed, and has been and will be accomplished in the very departments whose costliness every good citizen deplores—the departments devoted to the arrest, conviction and punishment of offenders, the maintenance of paupers, etc.,—must be counted as one of the crowning triumphs of the temperance reform.

---

[1] The *Voice*, Sept. 23, 1886.

But if we glance at the relation of strict liquor offenses to the total offenses, and from the aggregate cost of police services deduce that part of the cost occasioned by the saloons, it will instantly be concluded that effectual Prohibition, by its necessary influence upon the cost of the police department alone, cannot fail to do much toward squaring the losses due to extinguishment of liquor licenses. Comparisons are made in the table on p. 547 for 38 leading cities, the figures in each case being for the municipal year ending in 1889 or early in 1890. In every instance the arrests for "drunkenness and disorderly conduct" are for those specific offenses only, and the returns under such titles as "vagrancy," "loitering," "suspicious persons," "persons assisted to their homes," and under similar designations which veil mere liquor offenses, are ignored. No doubt this accounts for the comparatively small percentages in cities like Cincinnati, New Orleans, Kansas City (Mo.), Memphis, Richmond (Va.), Los Angeles and Charleston (S. C.), some of which are among the most notorious rum centers of the country. There is no discoverable reason why the "drunks and disorderlies" should constitute 85 per cent. of the total arrests in a comparatively quiet place like Trenton and only 27 per cent. in a city like Cincinnati which has so long been known as a Sodom of the saloon, 80 per cent. in Mobile and only 30 per cent. in Memphis, 77 per cent. in Hartford and only 21 per cent. in Kansas City (Mo.) The average percentage of 53 is really much too small,[1] but considering that it has been obtained without resorting to any process of interpretation, but simply by taking those figures that the designing police officials have not covered up with vague titles, it is significant enough.[2]

---

[1] A percentage that is nearer the real one, and yet probably under the mark, is that given for the city of Boston in 1881 by Carroll D. Wright, in his notable investigation of the "Influence of Intemperance upon Crime" in Massachusetts. (See footnote, p. 529.) Mr. Wright found that in the year covered by his inquiry 72 per cent. of all the commitments for offenses in Boston was for "distinctively rum offenses," and that this percentage was increased to 84 by counting the cases of persons who were in liquor at the time of committing offenses. It is not possible that so careful a statistician as Mr. Wright would have used these Boston figures for the purpose of a dispassionate study if the percentage of commitments for rum offenses shown by them had been above a fair average for large cities.

[2] The table on the next page is taken from the *Voice* for Nov. 20, 1890. (In all instances the figures as published in the *Voice* have been compared with original data; and some inaccuracies have been corrected.)

This table (p. 547) supplies an excellent basis for calculating the approximate total number of arrests caused peculiarly by drink, and the approximate total expenditure for police purposes on account of these drink-caused arrests, for all the cities of the United States.

According to the Census of 1880 (the 1890 returns for all cities not being available at the time this is written), the total population of all the cities having over 4.000 inhabitants was in that year 13,234,796. Of this population the 38 cities represented in the table had 6,614,140, or almost exactly one-half. Assuming that the remaining cities have as many arrests and spend as much for their police departments as the 38 cities instanced, we get the following figures:

Total arrests annually in all the cities having 4,000 or more inhabitants, with an aggregate population of 13,234.796 (as shown by the Census of 1880), 1,026,722.

Total annual expenses of the police departments of these cities, $33,370,600.

How many of these total arrests and how much of this total expenditure for the police are to be charged distinctively to drink? Clearly we cannot get at reliable results by using the average percentage of "drunks and disorderlies" given in the table. That percentage is ridiculously low. Even Mr. Carroll D. Wright's percentage of 72 for the city of Boston was too small for that city, and taking Mr. Wright's inquiry as a foundation we find that 84 is nearer the true percentage. (See footnote, p. 529.) But assuming that the arrests due to drink in the cities will average, in round numbers, 80 per cent. of all the arrests, the following conclusions are obtained:

Total annual arrests due to drink in cities having an aggregate of 13,234,796 population (Census of 1880), 820,978.

Total expenditures (proportionate) in these cities for police duty on account of the drink traffic, $26,696.480.

These figures are based on police returns for the year 1889 and population returns for the year 1880. The population of all the cities represented has increased largely since 1880, so that their aggregate number of inhabitants is probably now not less than 17,000,000. Therefore all the preceding estimates should be for a city population of about 17,000,000 instead of 13,234,796.

The total population of the United States, city and country, is about 63,000,000. Consequently the new cities

CITIES.	TOTAL ARRESTS.	ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS AND DISORDERLY CONDUCT.	PER CENT. OF ARRESTS THAT ARE FOR DRUNK AND DISORDERLY.	TOTAL EXPENSE OF MAINTAINING THE POLICE DEPARTMENT.	PROPORTIONATE COST OF POLICING DRUNKS AND DISORDERLIES.
New York	82,200	47,666	58	$4,426,347.11	$2,567,281.32
Chicago	48,119	27,536	57	1,602,594.60	913,478.92
Philadelphia	42,673	20,097	47	1,807,700.40	849,619.19
Brooklyn	34,331	19,592	57	1,588,439.99	905.410.79
St. Louis	19,724	9,207	47	571,850.00	268,769.50
Boston	40,066	25,418	63	1,181,914.46	744,606.11
Baltimore	31,420	20,100	64	780,010.79	499,206.91
San Francisco	23,549	12,773	54	535,493.79	289,166.65
Cincinnati	15,695	4,169	27	469,195.61	126,682.81
Cleveland	10,377	6,414	62	324,128.80	200,959.86
New Orleans	20,150	7,266	36	180,000.00	64,800.00
Washington, D. C	21,150	7,442	35	451,440.00	158,004.00
Denver	9,315	4,533	49	102,000.00	49,980.00
Detroit	8,746	5,259	60	321,877.56	193,126.54
Minneapolis [1]	7,426	4,069	55	194,241.55	106,832.85
Kansas City, Mo	7,779	1,667	21	163,500.00	34,335.00
Louisville	6,964	4,748	68	180.000.00	122,400.00
Memphis	7,213	2,129	30	57,583.88	17,275.16
Richmond, Va	6,901	2,610	38	97,222.50	36,944.55
St. Paul	6,888	3,447	50	178,983.02	89,491.51
Jersey City	6,617	3,658	55	270,333.12	148,683.22
Milwaukee	5,488	3,851	70	189,000.00	132,300.00
Lowell	4,557	3,318	72	89,954.07	64,766.93
Worcester	3,949	3,032	77	98,241.82	75,646.20
Dayton. O	3,735	1,863	50	49,917 50	24,958.75
Oakland, Cal	3,594	1,763	49	48,120.75	23,579,17
Los Angeles	3,756	1,153	31	78,000.00	24,180.00
Charleston, S. C	3.452	1,013	29	67.335.00	19,527.15
Hartford	3.343	2,581	77	66,000.00	50,820.00
Allegheny	3,214	2,242	69	85,000.00	58,650.00
Albany, N. Y	3,133	1,660	53	133,817.18	70,923.11
San Antonio	2,950	1,459	50	45,000.00	22,500.00
Wilmington, Del	2,862	1,470	51	45,000.00	22,950.00
Savannah	2,705	1,096	41	63,756.09	26,140.00
Mobile	2,504	2,001	80	28,520.00	22,816.00
Trenton	2,347	1,995	85	38,000.00	32,300.00
Wheeling	2,314	1,226	53	22,600.11	11,978.06
Grand Rapids	1,855	1,007	54	52,180.12	28,177.26
Totals	513,361	272,430	53	$16,685,299.82	$8,843,208.90

[1] There is an apparent discrepancy between these figures of arrests in Minneapolis and the figures given in the table on p. 521. But as is explained in the summary appended to that table, the police year was in 1889 changed so as to end on Dec. 31 instead of March 30, so that the arrests given on p. 521 include only nine months of the year 1889. To these figures for nine months we have added, in the table above the figures for the three months from Dec. 31, 1889, to March 31, 1890—making a full year. The expenses of the Police Department of Minneapolis for the year March 31, 1889, to March 31, 1890, are estimated.

This table shows in a practical way that if Prohibition can, as it does, greatly reduce arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct, a considerable part of the lost license revenue will at once be offset by a decrease in the cost of the police. Another large part of the police expense arises from the numerous contributions made by the saloons to the number of apprehensions for offenses other than "drunk and disorderly" (see Mr. Wright's statistics, footnote p. 529), and thus enforced Prohibition will effect another saving in the police department. A policy that lightens the work of the police must lighten the burden of the Courts and jails. And the public expenditure for almshouses, hospitals, asylums, reformatories and houses of refuge cannot fail to be materially lessened by a measure that so gratifyingly lessens crime and disorder.

All this simply applies the test of facts and common sense to the statements of the Kansas Probate Judges and the Iowa Prosecuting Attorneys. The familiar answer that ideal Prohibition and unexecuted Prohibition are entirely different things, and that unexecuted Prohibition is the more frequently encountered in the great cities, does not affect the fundamental consideration that the Prohibition policy, even as a fiscal measure, has within it the possibilities of beneficence, and that wide experience has failed to condemn even partial Prohibition on fiscal grounds.

---

that have reached the 4,000 mark since 1880, the smaller cities, the towns and the rural districts contain about 46,000,000 inhabitants. Among these are many Prohibitory localities. The work and cost of the police are relatively less in these than in the large centers already considered. Let us assume that the whole of these 46,000,000 people produce no more offenders and pay no more for police service than the 17,000,000 city people; nevertheless the number of arrests caused by the saloons for the whole country will then be not less than 1,600,000 annually, and the proportionate amount paid the police for making these saloon caused arrests will be more than $53,000,000 annually for the nation at large.

Nor does the second part of this assertion require any qualification. All Prohibition up to this date has been but partial. Given some encouraging degree of enforcement, and we shall invariably find that the tax assessments upon the general community are lighter or at most are not appreciably heavier because of the sacrifice of license revenues.

At times, it is true, there is an apparent increase. But when the reasons are sought it is seen that the advance has been brought about by special causes, oftenest by public improvements made possible (presumably) by greater prosperity. Thus the Hon. Charles Danforth, Justice of the Supreme Court of Maine for 25 years, gives the following discriminating account of the situation in that State:

> "I can very well remember the condition of the community in regard to temperance before and at the time the Prohibitory law was passed. The same financial evils were then prophesied as resulting from it as now. But so far as can be perceived none of them have come to pass. It is evident that less liquor is sold now than then. It is equally true that more of other and more wholesome business is done now. It is true taxes are higher now, but the difference is more than accounted for in the increased facilities for doing business, and improvements in better roads, schools, protection from fires and diseases, in lighted streets and more comfortable public buildings, as well as in all those things which pertain to a better life and higher civilization. So the increased public expense is more than compensated for by increased advantages to individuals. It is quite certain that the Prohibitory law has had nothing to do with this increased public expense. If it has tended to diminish intemperance it is self-evident that its tendency must be the other way."

Similar reports come from the Western Prohibition States. Taxes have decreased or have not increased—so testify the officials of most of the counties of Kansas and Iowa.[1] But those who confess an increase almost without exception account for it by saying that extensive improvements have been inaugurated since Prohibition took effect.

The writers who defend the liquor-saloons have unscrupulously attacked Prohibition by comparing tax-rates in Kansas and Iowa with tax-rates in certain selected license cities. For example, a leaflet used in all the recent Amendment campaigns, of which probably millions of copies were scattered, gave these figures: Tax-rate in Des Moines, 6.2 per cent.; in Atchison, 5.65 per cent.; in Topeka, 3.28 per cent.; in Kansas City (Mo.), 1.4 per cent. Any fair comparison of tax-rates in different communities involves the necessity of delicate distinctions. In some places natural conditions are more favorable to low taxes than in others; in some, at a given time, heavy but temporary burdens are imposed because of public enterprises, while in others no such enterprises are afoot; in some, extravagant and corrupt men are in charge, while in others economical and honorable officials administer affairs; in some, property is assessed for taxation purposes at but a mere fraction of its market value, while in others it is assessed at nearly or quite its actual value. Throughout Kansas and Iowa the custom is to assess property at from one-third to one-sixth its real worth, and thus a seemingly high tax-rate prevails, although the fact is that the tax-bills paid by citizens are, on the average, proportionately smaller than in neighboring license States.

Proof of this has been established by painstaking investigations. The Hon. Albert H. Horton, Chief-Justice of the Kansas Supreme Court, is authority for this statement:

> "From 1880 to 1889 the assessed value of property in Kansas has increased over $200,000,000. In Nebraska, under license, its valuation has increased only a little over $92,000,000. The average rate of increase in Kansas has been $20,000,000 annually, while in Nebraska it has been only $9,000,000. The increase in wealth in Kansas has more than doubled that of Nebraska, although the latter has been aided by its $1,000 license tax.
>
> "The tax-rate for State purposes [in Kansas] has steadily decreased since 1880, when it was 55 cents on $100, to 40 cents in 1889; while in Nebraska it has increased from 39 cents and 5 mills in 1880 to 63 cents and 3 mills in 1889. Its average rate [in Nebraska] for the last nine years has been 56 cents and 7 mills, making its present rate more than 50 per cent. higher than in Kansas, showing clearly that license for revenue increases instead of diminishing taxation."[2]

And the *Voice*, in 1890, by means of persistent correspondence, secured data from a majority of the county officials of Kansas, Iowa and Nebraska, which when analyzed showed conclusively that taxes were relatively higher in the High License State than in the two Prohibition States. We summarize the *Voice's* exhaustive tables.[1]

---

[1] See especially the *Voice*, April 4 and May 16, 1889.

[2] The *Voice*, Sept. 18, 1890.

Kansas: 73 of the 106 *Counties.*—Total assessed valuation of property in counties reporting, $280,984,573.07; total actual value, $1,016,782,230.61; total taxes levied for county purposes in counties reporting, $2,640,389.29; average amount represented by $100 of assessed valuation, $362; average rate on $100 of assessed valuation, $0.939; average actual rate of taxation on $100 in the counties reporting, $0.259.

Iowa: 82 *of the* 99 *Counties.*—Total assessed valuation of property in counties reporting, $435,570,141.50; total actual value, $1,346,104,100; total taxes levied for county purposes in counties reporting, $3,851,061.07; average amount represented by $100 of assessed valuation, $310; average rate on $100 of assessed valuation, $0.884; average actual rate of taxation on $100 in the counties reporting, $0.286; *average actual rate in 72 counties, exclusive of* 10 *Mississippi river counties in which it is said the Prohibitory law is not enforced,* $0.269.

Nebraska: 68 *of the* 88 *Counties.*—Total assessed valuation of property in counties reporting, $141,094,705.16; total actual value, $802,215,068.80; total taxes levied for county purposes in counties reporting, $2,226,857.34; average amount represented by $100 of assessed valuation, $568; average rate on $100 of assessed valuation, $1.577; average actual rate of taxation on $100 in the counties reporting, $0.277.

Summary of Actual Tax-Rates (County Purposes).—Kansas, $0.259 per $100; Iowa (omitting 10 Mississippi river counties), $0.269 per $100; Nebraska, $0.277; per $100.

Average Tax-Rates for County and State Purposes Combined.—Kansas (73 counties), $1.349 per $100 of assessed valuation, or $0.372 *per $100 of actual value.* Iowa (72 counties), $1.134 per $100 of assessed valuation, or $0.350 *per $100 of actual value.* Nebraska (68 counties), $2.227 per $100 of assessed valuation, or $0.391 *per $100 of actual value.*

These scrupulously fair and most valuable comparisons remove all possibility of doubt as to the harmlessness of a tolerably well-enforced Prohibitory law in its effects upon State and county taxation. But they do not illustrate the consequences upon taxation for city purposes. In regard to city taxation it is very difficult, indeed impracticable, to make general averages for a whole State. Local differences cause wide variations in local tax-rates, and to strike a general average for various cities would be much like averaging different fractions without reducing them to a common denominator—an impossible task. But if several typical cities of Prohibition and license States, respectively, are examined, it can at least be learned whether the tendency in the Prohibition cities gives color to unfavorable representations. The *Voice* supplemented its county tax returns by comparing cities of Kansas with cities of Nebraska and Missouri, and cities of Iowa with cities of Michigan, Minnesota and Wisconsin, as follows:[2]

CITIES.	Ass'd valuation of all property, real or personal (1889).	Tax levied for city purposes, including school(1889).	$100 of ass'd valuation represents	Rate on $100 of assessed valuation.	Rate on $100 of actual valuation.
Kansas:					
Topeka	$9,228,838.60	$278,710.93	$500	$3.02	$.60
Kan. City	8,000,000.00	237,600.00	350	2.97	.85
Salina	1,735,189.79	50,667.54	400	2.92	.73
Ottawa	1,300,000.00	43,500.00	400	3.35	.84
Abilene	815,000.00	29,340.00	450	3.60	.80
N'br'ska:					
Omaha	20,047,589.00	994,881.42	700	4.96	.71
Lincoln	5,600,000.00	217,342.05	600	3.95	.66
G'd Isla'd	1,059,068.00	44,701.30	600	4.22	.70
Fremont	837,000.00	35,363.25[1]	800	4.25	.53
Wahoo	290,000.00	11,890.00	500	4.10	.82
Missouri:					
St. Joseph	23,610,000.00	389,465.00[2]	230	1.65	.72
Hannibal	3,402,830.00	62,952.34	150	1.85	1.24
Carthage	1,645,678.00	31,267.88	300	1.90	.63
Moberly	1,050,000.00	25,200.00	300	2.40	.80
Clinton	1,114,020.00	16,710.30	200	1.50	.75

[1] Fremont's report does not include water-works and interest on water bonds and City Hall, Court House and intersection bonds. [2] Not stated whether school tax is included.

CITIES.	Ass'd valuation of all property, real and personal (1889).	Tax levied for city purposes for 1889, school tax included.	$100 of ass'd valuation represents	Rate on $100 of assessed valuation.	Rate on $100 of actual valuation.
Iowa:					
Burling'n	$4,393,445.00	$184,446.78	$400	$4.20	$1.05
Cedar Rapids	3,172,300.00	90,029.32[1]	400	2.84	.71
D. Moines	11,396,840.00	331,648,04[2]	500	2.91	.58
Dubuque	17,868,940.00	188,500.09[2]	200	1.05	.52
Musc'tine	2,462,567.00	66,489.30	300	2.70	.90
Osk'loosa	1,299,979.00	57,605,47	400	4.43	1.11
Waterloo	1,035,689.00	39,515.08	250	3.73	1.50
Michig'n:					
Jackson	7,037,040.00	148,509.93	300	2.11	.70
E. Saginaw[3]	10,665,220.00	251,353.20	150	2.36	1.57
Saginaw[3]	5,300,000.00	112,890.00	150	2.13	1.42
Battle C'k	3,780,151.00	48,500.00[2]	200	1.28	64
Manistee	2,378,610.00	69,931.13	300	2.94	.98
Min'sota:					
Min'polis	127,101,861.00	2,948,290.95	400	2.32	.58
Duluth	22,047,322.00	414,489.65	....	1.88	..
Winona	6,832,228.00	198,818.66	250	2.91	1.16
Red Wing	1,770,988.00	27.987.33[2]	300	1.58	.53
Hastings	1,186,790.00	19.049.61	150	1.60	1.07
Brainerd	1,641,621.00	34,474.04	150	2.10	1.40
Anoka	1,417,531.00	30,496.92	200	2.15	1.08
Wisc'sin:					
Madison	6,396,917.00	79,618.57	150	1.24	.83
Milw'kee	100,498,200.00	1,831,746.71	200	1.82	.91
Oshkosh	7,093,005.00	167,040.56	200	2.35	1.18
Sheb'gan	3,742,435.00	97,951.35	250	2.62	1.05
Appleton	3,504,725.00	84,176.60	300	2.40	.80
Manitowoc	1,821,825.00	46,291.65	200	2.54	1.27

[1] Not stated whether school tax is included. [2] School tax *not* included. [3] Saginaw and East Saginaw are now one.

---

[1] See the *Voice*, Oct. 30, 1890.

[2] Ibid, Oct. 2, 1890.

Naturally the city tax-rates in all the States instanced show marked differences. But there is nothing in the Kansas and Iowa figures to fortify the anti-Prohibitionists' assertions.

If the evidence that we have given is taken with some allowance because it has been collated by Prohibitionist partisans, the same objection will not attach to the following Census statistics :

States.	Total Debt, Bonded and Floating.		Per cent. of Increase.	Total Available Resources.		Per cent. of Increase.	Debt in Excess of Resources.		Per. cent. of Increase in Excess.
	1880.	1890.		1880.	1890.		1880.	1890.	
In Western States :									
Iowa (Prohibition)...............	$2,161,817	$3,242,370	50	$149,226	$692,819	364	$2,055,300	$2,617,674	27
Kansas (Prohibition).............	2,296,620	3,207,110	40	111,216	555,261	399	2,185,404	2,940,138	35
Colorado (License)...............	221,768	1,464,689	560	55,167	880,584	1,496	196,981	706,439	259
Minnesota (High License).........	2,007,590	9,016,144	349	847,839	1,339,415	285	1,659,751	7,678,864	363
Nebraska (High License)..........	410,897	2,957,669	620	28,150	74,303	164	382.747	2,883,366	653
Oregon (License).................	94,300	824,219	774	2,474	27,775	1,023	91,826	796,444	767
Wisconsin (License)..............	4,074,046	5,229,662	28	340,628	1,094,670	221	3,760,175	4,312,831	15
In Eastern States:									
Maine (Prohibition)..............	14,211,189	11,712,903	—18	8,595,946	5,385,147	50	10,619,514	6,336,882	—40
Vermont (Prohibition)............	1,178,527	747,927	—37	80,594	177,640	120	1,097,933	570,287	—48
New Hampshire (Semi-License)..	3,738,729	4,338,687	16	966,895	1,211,860	25	2,783,395	3,138.593	13
Massachusetts (High License)....	81,124.974	97,237,392	20	25,643,826	39,979,182	56	55,557,798	57,486,108	3
Connecticut (License)	11,867,187	10,893,303	—8	2,788,523	2,640,073	—5	9,109,746	8,253,230	—9
Rhode Island (License)...........	12,184,527	14,462,795	19	1,419,677	2,747,863	94	10,771,185	11,714.932	9
New York (License)...............	208,589,798	220,047,805	5	41,995,267	94,509,239	125	166,620,658	125,602,169	—25
New Jersey (License)............	43,694,465	45,723,131	5	6,334,471	9,420,409	49	37,816,504	37,215,252	—1

The table is from the Census returns for 1890, under the title of "Total Debts and Available Resources of Representative Municipalities in Various States for 1880 and 1890," as given in Census Bulletin No. 14 (Table 51), issued by the Census Bureau near the end of 1890. Not all the cities in the respective States are included—only certain ones selected by the Census officials as typical.

It is not a little significant that the tax argument has least weight with citizens who have actually experienced the results of Prohibition and may be regarded as more candid judges than the drunkard-makers and their subsidized editors and pamphleteers. Year after year the tax-payers of four-fifths of the Massachusetts towns and a number of the cities of that State steadily decline to accept license money from saloons, although the statute places no limit upon the fee which any locality may fix for the privilege of liquor-selling. No intelligent man, knowing the practical spirit of the Massachusetts "Yankee," will say that this sturdy opposition is caused by mere blind fanaticism or runs counter to sound fiscal policy. It is indeed a most instructive fact that a vast majority of the communities of so conservative a State, after nearly half a century of alternate trials of Prohibition and license, have come to the settled conclusion that it is best on all grounds not to invite the saloons to assist in paying taxes. The town of Dracut, Mass., with a population of about 2,000, made a novel experiment in 1890. Only one liquor license was issued, and the great price of $8,000 was charged for it. The licensee immediately prepared to conduct business on a large scale, and the prospects seemed bright for him, since the city of Lowell, close by, had voted for Prohibition and had no licensed saloons to supply the demand. For two days Dracut was thronged with a drunken rabble, and then the Town Selectmen, with the approval of the citizens who had most at stake, cancelled the $8,000 license.[1] Always it is found, where Prohibition is in effect or is proposed, that as a class the well-to-do citizens, the men who have tax-bills to pay and whose judgment as to consequences is keenest, are inclined to discountenance license on any terms, and that the scum of the population, the thieves and loafers, the irresponsible and the illiterate individuals, are the readiest supporters of the proposition that license promotes the public welfare and reduces taxes.

---

[1] The *Voice*, May 22, 1890.

The assertion that Prohibition has a depopulating tendency is founded either on dense ignorance or on heartless misrepresentations. Intrinsically it is ludicrous. The evidence that enforced Prohibition cleanses a community of its crime-producing and disorder-breeding institutions, makes less work for the police, the Courts and the prison and almshouse keepers, and is of benefit also to the material interests of the people as a whole, is too abundant and positive to be disputed. By what method of reasoning can it be predicted that in consequence of the very policy which has such effects the increase of population will be retarded? The saloon-keepers, bartenders, brewers and distillers, and numbers of rogues and ruffians of high and low degree, will probably move away: that is admitted. But their aggregate number is relatively small, and even if no better people come to take their places the loss must be esteemed an economic gain. It is said that a considerable element of "liberal" citizens, respectable and estimable, will not brook Prohibitory interference with their personal liberty and will hasten away from the puritanical spot. But while some highly intolerant persons of this class may impulsively desire to leave, very few whose retention is really desirable will actually do so. Local ties are strong; established business and social interests are not sacrificed by prudent men for the sake of a prejudice or a whim; the personal grievance will be endured with a certain fortitude, sustained by a confidence in the resources of the express office and a willingness to await tangible evidence of the probability of improving the existing lot. Therefore it may be expected that the offended drinking man, if he is indeed a useful member of the community, will emulate the example set by a well-known capitalist, who in a heated Presidential campaign announced that if a particular candidate were successful he would sell his property at 50 cents on the dollar, but after the election of the abhorred aspirant clung to his possessions with unrelaxed tenacity. The behavior of the violent Boston partisan, who committed suicide on the night of another Presidential election because the returns showed the defeat of his favorite, has few parallels. It is natural for individuals—and worthy individuals—of strong prejudices to declare that they will shake the dust of a certain locality from their feet if a measure distasteful to them is carried; but it is equally natural for all men of ordinary sense to remain in the old place of residence until there is visible proof that the conditions of life will be bettered by removing to another place.

"If any person," says Justice Valentine of the Supreme Court of Kansas, "has refused to immigrate to this State because of the Prohibition of liquor-saloons, then the State is undoubtedly that much better for it, and if any person has removed from the State because of the Prohibition of liquor-saloons the State is equally benefited."[1] This opinion, however uncomplimentary to some who drink in "moderation" and with "innocence," expresses a conviction that is deep-rooted in the most observant men of Kansas and every other Prohibition State. "As regards the assertion that Prohibition has driven people out of the State," writes ex-Governor Larrabee of Iowa, "I think not a person has left the State on account of Prohibition whom it is desirable to have return."[2] It is needless to amplify such testimony. An overwhelming majority of the State, county and local officials, and of the most respectable private citizens, declare that the Prohibitory laws have operated to increase rather than to diminish the total population, and, what is more important, to elevate its character. And there is nowhere a keener sensitiveness to all influences that may disturb growth than in Iowa and Kansas.

In the following table the populations (1870, 1880 and 1890) of the Prohibition States are compared with those of their nearest license neighbors, and in each instance where a State Census was taken in 1885 the figures are given:

---

[1] The *Voice*, Oct. 9, 1890.

[2] Letter to Rev. William Fuller of Aberdeen, S. D., Feb. 16, 1889. (See the "Political Prohibitionist for 1889," p. 53.)

STATES.	1870.	1880.	1885.	1890.
Maine..........	626,915	648,936	....	661,086
Vermont.......	330,551	332,286	....	332,422
New Hampshire	318,300	346,991	....	376,530
Massachusetts..	1,457,351	1,783,085	1,942,141	2,238,943
Connecticut....	537,454	622,700	....	746.258
Rhode Island...	217,353	276,531	304,284	345,506
Kansas	364,399	996,096	1,268,530	1,427,096
Iowa	1,194,020	1,624,615	1,753,980	1,911,896
North Dakota..	14,181	36,909	415,610	182,719
South Dakota..		98,268		328.808
Nebraska.......	122,993	452,402	740,645	1,058,910
Missouri	1,721,295	2,168,380	....	2,679,184
Minnesota......	439,706	780,773	1,117,798	1,301,826

Maine and *Vermont* have each been under Prohibition for more than 30 years. *New Hampshire* while prohibiting the retail sale licenses the manufacture. *Massachusetts* and *Connecticut* have been steadily under license in the last decade. *Rhode Island* was under license from 1880 to 1886 and from 1889 to 1890; under Prohibition from 1886 to 1889. *Kansas* voted for Prohibition in 1880 and *Iowa* in 1883. The *Dakotas*, while voting for Prohibition in 1889, were steadily under license up to that time, as were *Nebraska*, *Missouri* and *Minnesota*.

Below are given the actual increases and the percentages of increase.

STATES.	1870 TO 1880.		1880 TO 1890.	
	INCREASE.		INCREASE.	
Maine	22,021, or	3.51 %	12,150 or	1.87 %
Vermont	1,735 “	0.52 “	136 “	0.04 “
New Hampshire.....	28,691 “	9.01 “	29,539 “	8.51 “
Massachusetts.....	325,734 “	22.35 “	455,858 “	25.57 “
Connecticut..	85,246 “	15.86 “	123,558 “	19.84 “
Rhode Island	59,178 “	27.23 “	68,975 “	24.94 “
Kansas	631,697 “	173.35 “	431,000 “	43.27 “
Iowa	430,595 “	36.06 “	287,281 “	17.68 “
North Dakota	120,996 “	853.23 “	145.810 “	395.05 “
South Dakota			230.540 “	234.60 “
Nebraska....	329.409 “	267.83 “	606,508 “	134.60 “
Missouri	447,085 “	25.97 “	510,804 “	23.56 “
Minnesota ...	341,067 “	77.57 “	521,053 “	66.74 “

Increases in States Reporting Population Figures for 1885.—Massachusetts: 1880 to 1885, 159,056, or 8.9 per cent.; 1885 to 1890, 296,802, or 15.3 per cent. Rhode Island: 1880 to 1885, 27,753, or 10 per cent.; 1885 to 1890, 41,222, or 13.5 per cent. Kansas: 1880 to 1885, 272,434, or 27.4 per cent.; 1885 to 1890, 158,566, or 12.5 per cent. Iowa: 1880 to 1885, 129,365, or 8 per cent.; 1885 to 1890, 157,916, or 9 per cent. The Dakotas: 1880 to 1885, 280,433, or 207.5 per cent.; 1885 to 1890, 95,917, or 23.1 per cent. Nebraska: 1880 to 1885, 288,243, or 63.7 per cent.; 1885 to 1890, 318,265, or 43 per cent. Minnesota: 1880 to 1885, 337,025, or 43.2 per cent.; 1885 to 1890, 184,028, or 16 5 per cent.

Viewed apart from explanations it may be thought that these statistics make an unfavorable showing for the Prohibition States. This conclusion is not borne out by impartial study.

In Maine and Vermont, the complete Prohibition States of New England, agriculture, lumbering and similar industries engage the people, and manufactures have not been developed. There are no large cities to concentrate population and induce rapid growth. Besides, the soil is less favorable to profitable agriculture than that of most other parts of the Union, many farms have been abandoned because of their unproductiveness, and as the young men grow up they seek the richer lands of the West. The same is partly true of New Hampshire, although several cities of that State are assuming importance and manufacturing is a more prominent industry than in Maine and Vermont—an explanation that fully accounts for the advantage in point of increase of population that this semi-Prohibition State has over the complete Prohibition States adjacent to it. In Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island, the remaining States of the group, manufacturing is conducted on a great scale and large cities are numerous—hence the larger growth. The Census Bureau, in its review of the New England population returns, officially attributes these differences to the very causes above indicated, and to no other causes. It says that the small rate of increase in Maine, Vermont and New Hampshire is "probably due to the fact of a large migration of the farming population to the far West, and manufactures not having yet assumed sufficient prominence," and that Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island have enjoyed greater growth because in them "manufactures have assumed so great prominence."[1] If Prohibition has had a prejudicial effect in New England the State of Rhode Island ought to exhibit a relatively small increase for the half-decade 1885–90, since a Prohibitory law was in effect during three years of the five; but the increase in that period was 41,222, or 13.5 per cent., as against 27,753, or 10 per cent., in the half-decade 1880–5, when license was the law uninterruptedly.

Of the Western States represented in the tables it is observable that Iowa and Kansas, with the single exception of Missouri, had the largest populations in 1880. Missouri's superiority in that year was due partly to the fact that it was an older State than any of the others and partly to the great population of such cities as St. Louis, Kansas City and St. Joseph: 505,903 of its inhabitants in 1880 were embraced in cities having above 4,000 inhabitants, while in Kansas there were only 84,907 inhabitants in such cities and in Iowa 201,800. Natural circumstances kept Missouri in the lead during the decade 1880–90; yet with all the advantages in its favor it shows only 23.56 per cent. of increase as against 43.27 per cent. in the Prohibition State of Kansas. Mere percentages, however, are misleading, for when a State has attained a development greater than that of its younger neighbor its growth (if the younger commonwealth presents inducements to immigrants) is quite certain to be smaller in percentage, even though the numerical increase may be larger. The significant fact in comparing Kansas and Missouri is that the former has had nearly as large a numerical increase as the latter, notwithstanding the prestige that such centers as St. Louis and Kansas City give to Missouri in the race for supremacy.

---

[1] Census Bulletin No. 16 (1890), p. 7.

The same distinctions must govern comparisons between Iowa and Kansas on the one hand and Nebraska, Minnesota and the Dakotas on the other. Here the older States are Iowa and Kansas. The other three were comparatively undeveloped in 1880. Their vast unoccupied lands offered greater possibilities to greater numbers. Anyone who is disinclined to attach much importance to this explanation will recognize its weight when the history of Oklahoma Territory is recalled. Oklahoma is a rich region, but no richer than many other parts of the West; yet when it was thrown open to settlement in 1889 its virgin fields were so eagerly coveted that more than 60,000 people took residence there within a year. Besides, the Nebraska cities of Omaha and Lincoln and the Minnesota cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis were in their infancy in 1880: the enormous growth that these places enjoyed in the succeeding 10 years is almost without precedent. The Dakotas, on the contrary, have no cities comparable with Minnesota's and Nebraska's, and the Dakota increase of population has been almost wholly in the rural districts. While very large it is numerically less than Kansas's.

Therefore we see that the operation of natural laws of development fully accounts for the larger gains made by Missouri, Minnesota and Nebraska. Another vital fact is to be mentioned. In Kansas there have been disastrous crop failures, caused by insufficient rainfall and lack of artificial irrigation. Thousands of farms in central and western Kansas have been abandoned for this reason. (See Census Bulletin No. 16 [1890], p. 8.) The annual State Censuses of Kansas give the following totals of population for 1885 and succeeding years: 1885, 1,268,530; 1886, 1,406,738; 1887, 1,514,578; 1888, 1,518,552; 1889, 1,464,914. In 1890, as shown by the Federal Census, there was a further decrease of 37,818. In the period from 1880 to 1888 (during which the enforcement of Prohibition had constantly become more rigid) the population increased from 996,096 to 1,518,552. In face of such figures it is absurd to suppose that the subsequent decline could have been brought about by Prohibition. Our interpretation of the facts is the interpretation made by the State officials of Kansas, who certainly would be glad to remove the impression, if possible, that crops are failing and therefore that Kansas is losing its former eminence as an agricultural State.

Candid inspection of Iowa's Census returns is equally reassuring. The Prohibitory law took effect in 1885. The population during the years 1880–5 (license) increased 129,365, or 8 per cent., but during 1885–90 (Prohibition) there was a gain of 157,916, or 9 per cent.

As a specimen of the flagrant falsehoods propagated by the liquor advocates in discussing the relations of Prohibition to population, the case of the city of Leavenworth, Kan., may be cited. In 1889 the statement was telegraphed over the country that Leavenworth had lost 14,000 inhabitants in the year just closed because of the enforcement of the Prohibitory law. This report was on the authority of the Clerk of the county. Inquiry proved that the Clerk and other local officials were under the control of the liquor element. For years they had systematically overstated the population of Leavenworth. In 1889 the true figures were published, and as they were 14,000 smaller than those for 1888 the blame was laid to Prohibition. But according to municipal returns the personal property assessed for taxation had a larger aggregate value in 1889 than in 1888, the number of children of school age was about the same as in 1888, the number of names in the City Directory had not changed materially and the prosperity of the city had advanced.[1]

Benefits to the Wage-Workers and the Poor.

Under this head, if Prohibitory legislation accomplishes its fundamental purpose of closing the public drinking-places and greatly limiting opportunities to obtain drink, must fall its crowning results. The wage-workers and the poor support the saloons to their own bitter injury. Constituting a great majority of the people, whatever is most hurtful to these classes, to the development of thrift, education, good habits, good citizenship and a satisfactory home life among them, cannot fail to be most hurtful to the whole community and all its interests. To say this is to state the most manifest of truths. The question whether Prohibition may not be an unnecessary or unwarranted device so far as certain individuals or even certain elements of the population are concerned, does not affect the proposition that if no drink could be had the condition of the masses would be improved. The broadest consequences of effectual Prohibition must always be shown in the positive good done and the positive harm prevented among the multitude.

In what has already been written, testimony incidental to this topic abounds. The remarkable blessings of Prohibition in cities like Pullman and Saltaire, peopled almost exclusively by day-laborers; the gratifying decrease of arrests during the Prohibition years in other typical workingmen's cities like Lowell, Lawrence, Fall River and Atlanta, the practical disappearance of pauperism wherever Prohibition is strictly enforced in Kansas and other States, the increased prosperity of tradesmen under well-executed Prohibitory laws everywhere, are results that could not have been attained without a general improvement of the working classes.

Chief-Justice Horton of the Supreme Court of Kansas says:

> "All classes in Kansas have been benefited by Prohibition. Its beneficent influence has reached rich and poor, but most of all it has helped the laboring man. . . . Prohibition drove out the robber and despoiler of the poor. The effect of the passage of the law in our manufacturing towns was immediate. The hand of the liquor-seller, before stretched out between the employer and the employe, disappeared from the pay-table. Grocers, bakers, dealers in clothing noticed a change. The money came to them, for the necessaries of life, that before had been expended for its bane and curse. So it was continued. The traps before set at every step for the feet of the laboring man disappeared. The father is no longer allured, with the consent of the State, to squander the money of his wife and little children. He no longer takes the furniture or the scanty clothing from his little house, and, exchanging it for money at the pawn-shop, spends the proceeds at the nearest saloon. Employers have repeatedly testified to the benefits which came with the change. However numerous may be that class which the enemies of Prohibition gleefully assert exists, who send hundreds of miles for liquor to be consumed secretly within the State, it may safely be assumed that the laboring men, the men who earn daily wages by the toil that consumes the day, do not go to the trouble and expense of sending out of the State that they may start a home saloon of which their children are to be the customers. These thousands of workingmen, the bone and sinew, are worth to the State all that Prohibition may have cost, and the State will most certainly continue to maintain that law, which, whatever it may be to the rich, is the salvation of the poor."[2]

The following is a part of the speech made by Henry W. Grady in Atlanta, Nov. 3, 1887, after a year and one-half of Prohibition in that city:

> "In getting evidence of improvement or deterioration in a city you must go to the working classes. Especially is this true of Atlanta, because this is the third city in the United States in the proportion of workers to population. Lawrence, Mass., leads with 51 per cent. of her population wage-earners, Lowell follows with 48 per cent., and Atlanta and Fall Liver tie for third place with 47 per cent. Now here is a class of people representing in the workers of our number 47 per cent. of the entire population. Add the women and children who do not work, and we see this class represents 66 or 70 per cent. of our population. If this class is benefited in an unspeakable manner by the untried experiment of Prohibition, is it not our duty to continue this experiment that the greatest good may come to the greatest number?
>
> "When you go to get the effect of a new movement for good or evil, where do you go? Not to the rich and idle, because you may swell or diminish their income and yet not change their habits; you simply diminish the hidden surplus. Nor to the middle class, because when you diminish their income they simply pinch themselves and pinch so quietly that their neighbors do not know it, or swell their incomes and they loosen out a little and pass something up to surplus. You cannot tell it there; but go to the poorer classes—the men who labor for their daily

---

[1] See the *Voice*, Sept. 19, 1889.

[2] Speech at Lincoln, Neb., Sept. 9, 1890. (See the *Voice*, Sept. 18, 1890.)

bread, and whose wages barely suffice to give it to them; and there you find the first signs of a good or evil movement. It is at once the truth and reproach of our civilization that starvation follows so close on labor that an evil movement is detected in the hollow cheeks of little children and the haggard faces of women before it is made manifest to the higher classes.

"Mr. George Adair rents houses to 1,300 tenants. He states that he has issued in the last year one distress warrant where he issued 20 two years ago. [Applause.] I claim to be an intelligent man with some courage of conviction; but I pledge you my word, if that one fact were established to my satisfaction, I would vote for this thing if I never heard another word on this subject. Have you thought what that means—a distress warrant? It means eviction; it means the very thing that is to-day kindling the heart of this world for poor Ireland. It means eviction! It means turning woman and her little children out of the home that covers them, and to which they are entitled. I was astonished at Col. Adair's statement. Mr. Tally, who rents 600 or 800 houses, says: 'I used to issue two or three distress warrants—four or five—a month. I have not issued a single one in 18 months.' [Applause.]

"Now, both of them are Prohibitionists. Let me try you with Harry Krouse. He was an anti-Prohibitionist. He said: 'My distress warrants averaged 36 to the year, and I have not issued one in 12 months.' I said:

"'Then, my friend, I don't carry your conscience, but how can you be an anti-Prohibitionist?'

"'I ain't. My knowledge of the thing, day by day, among people I used to pester and evict, has changed my convictions, and I am a red-hot Prohibitionist.'

"I went down to Mr. Scott, who did not vote for Prohibition, and asked him. He said: 'I have issued as many as 25 distress warrants in a month, and I have issued 6 in the last 18 months, and 5 were to get people out of houses because they were obnoxious to the neighbors. I have issued one single distress warrant for failure to pay rent.'

"I said, 'You didn't vote for Prohibition?'

"He said, 'I did not believe it was practicable.'

"I asked, 'What do you think now?'

"He said, 'I am going to vote, and vote for Prohibition.' [Applause.]

"Mr. Roberts was a Prohibitionist. He says: 'My testimony is the same. I formerly issued two or three distress warrants every month, and I have not issued one in 12 months.'

"Is there any possible answer to that? Is there any industrial, any social, any economic revolution that has been worked since this world began that would account for the diminution in this most vicious and intolerable of legal enactments? Have you thought about what a distress warrant is? Have you ever thought about a woman being turned out of her house—the little cottage that covers her and her children? Can you picture—you who live in comfortable homes filled with light and warmth and books and joy,—can you think of these people—human beings, our brothers and sisters,—the poor mother, brave though her heart is breaking, huddling her little children about her, and the father, weak but loving, and loving all the deeper because he knows his weakness has brought them to this want and degradation, and little children, those of whom our Saviour said: 'Suffer them to come unto me and forbid them not,' there asking, 'Mamma, where will we sleep to-night?'—can you picture that and then their taking themselves up and the woman putting her hand with undying love and faith in the hand of the man she swore to follow through good and evil report, and marching up and down the street—this pitiable procession,—through the unthinking streets, by laughing children and shining windows, looking for a hole where, like the foxes, they may hide their poor heads? My friends, they talk to you about personal liberty, that a man should have the right to go into a grogshop and see this pitiable procession—now stopped—parading up and down our streets again. They talk to you about the shades of Washington, Monroe and Jefferson. I would not give one happy, rosy little woman, uplifted from that degradation, happy again in her home, with the cricket chirping on her hearthstone and her children about her knee, her husband redeemed from drink at her side—I would not give one of them for all the shades of all the men that ever contended since Cataline conspired and Cæsar fought! . . .

"I have talked to you about the rent, about the house that a man and his wife live in; I have shown you, not by my own assertion, but by the statements of the only experts in the city—the real estate men, who for years have handled from 3,000 to 4,000 houses,—I have shown you, I say, that where 20 suffered before 19 are protected under 'Prohibition that don't prohibit.' What would we have with Prohibition that did prohibit? The next step is to get our employers and ask their testimony. I went to Mr. Boyd, of Van Winkle & Co., and he said, 'Where I formerly had 10 or 15 garnishments at a time to answer, I now have none.'

"The garnishment, next to the distress warrant, is the most iniquitous form of debt collection. It means that the law lays its hand on a man's wages and holds them in its grasp, though his little children may clamber about his knees and cry for bread. Now, where there were twenty necessary then, there is one now.

"Mr. Boyd is a Prohibitionist; let me give you Grant Wilkins. He is a man of profound convictions. . . . He said he was one of the most violent, if that word may be used, of the anti-Prohibitionists. He said: 'I have told them I was not going to attend their "Anti" meetings, that I did not intend to have anything to do with it this time. I came to that conclusion simply because I work 220 men, and I see what Prohibition has done for them, and I believe my duty requires I should let it alone. My foreman goes to their homes and sees them; they live better, their houses are better, they have shoes where they were shoeless, and they have plenty to eat where they formerly barely lived. I have had 30 garnishments at once in my shop, and I have been running seven months, and I have not answered one single garnishment.' . . .

I could absolutely weary you with testimony like that. . . .

"There are 829 more children in attendance at the schools this year than last. How do you account for that? It has been two years since Prohibition was adopted, and there are 829 more children in the schools. That means one of two things, and you can take either horn of the dilemma: either there are more people here, or there are more people able to send to school.

"Take the fact of owning houses. . . . In the last two years there have been 687 citizens who have become home-owners, against 153 in the two years previous—citizens owing no man and owning no man as master, wearing the collar of no faction, free-born American citizens, not quibbling about personal liberty, but standing with wife and little ones, honest and independent, above penury and degradation!"

Two years after Atlanta had repealed her Prohibitory law—and in the interval a rigid High License system had been in force—the *Voice* submitted a series of questions to a list of Atlanta tradesmen, physicians and real estate dealers, made up from a business directory with no knowledge of their opinions.

To the inquiry whether sales to workingmen had increased or decreased since the return of the open barrooms there were replies from 38 retail merchants, of whom 24 declared emphatically that they had decreased. Many of these statements were highly suggestive. A general merchandise dealer said: "A decrease of 20 per cent.;" a furniture dealer said: "The first Saturday night after the repeal of Prohibition we had a decrease of $28 in our sales, which are now about one-half what they were to laboring people during Prohibition;" a dealer in family groceries reported "a decrease of 25 per cent.;" a boot and shoe dealer asserted that his sales to workingmen had decreased "about one-half;" a dealer in coal and wood said: "When the barrooms were closed I sold to the working people at the rate of half a ton at a time, but now they buy 25 and 50 cents' worth." Of the remaining 14 retailers nine wrote that the volume of their trade with workingmen had not changed materially since the return of the barrooms, and three of these nine were, judging from their replies to other questions, personally prejudiced against Prohibition and presumably depended somewhat upon saloon patronage; while two were booksellers and binders. There remain five retail tradesmen not classified above: of these, two said that they did not have dealings with the working classes in their lines of business, one that trade had improved but that the improvement was due to the growth of the city and to better crops—not to the saloons, and two that their sales to workingmen had increased. *These last two—the only retailers who had been positively benefited in their relations with the wage classes because of Prohibition's repeal—were both liquor-dealers:* one of them, who combined rumselling with groceries, declared that there had been "about 200 per cent. increase" in his business, and the other, a plain saloon-keeper, wrote: "My sales to workingmen have increased." Answers to the question from three merchants doing an exclusively wholesale business were received, of whom two reported a decrease and one said that, having little to do with the workingmen, he could not make a satisfactory reply. Thus *of the Atlanta merchants responding categorically, yes or no,* 26 *affirmed that their sales to the wage-earning citizens had fallen off since the return to license, and only two reported an increase of such sales—and these two were engaged in the liquor traffic.*

The replies given by the tradesmen to the other questions of the *Voice* were of the same tenor. It was asked whether the number of cash sales to laborers had not decreased and the credit sales correspondingly increased, and of 39 who answered 28 made affirmative statements, nine said there was no change or wrote indefinitely and the two liquor-dealers were alone in reporting that their cash business with wage-earning customers was better. "They do not ask for credit but pay as they go," contentedly wrote the saloon-keeper—the only man in the list, except his groceries-rum colleague, who had found that license had improved the cash business. The testimony was strong to the effect that it was harder to make collections than it had been in the Prohibition years, that "bad debts" were more numerous and that the working people purchased a cheaper class of goods. "The working people buy cheaper grades of goods," wrote a dry-goods dealer. "For instance, under Prohibition they bought hosiery worth 25 cents and now they want 10 and 15 cents hosiery; for flannels they would pay 35 to 50 cents but now they pay 20 to 30 cents; they used to buy shoes worth $1.50 to $2, but now they give only $1 to $1.50."

Letters were received from 15 Atlanta physicians, of whom two-thirds declared that in their practice among the working people they noticed more poverty and destitution than there had been when the Prohibitory law existed, and the majority who answered at all said that it was harder than it had formerly been to collect bills from the working classes and that these classes had fewer of the comforts of life.

Only 10 answers came from real estate men. While some of the writers were clearly anti-Prohibitionists, the replies to the question, "Are you obliged to issue more or fewer distress warrants to this [working] class of people than you did under Prohibition?" were very significant. Two ignored the question altogether, two evaded it by saying they had issued no distress warrants since Prohibition was voted down, but did not state whether they had issued any during the Prohibition era, one said he had issued none in several years, and five said positively, "More." "Yes, more by three to one," was the assertion of one dealer. The same general testimony was given by the real estate agents in answer to the questions whether it was not harder to collect rents from the laboring men than it had been under Prohibition and whether the families of these men were not worse housed and less comfortable.[1]

---

[1] The *Voice*, Jan. 2 and 9, 1890.

With the same impartiality and thoroughness the *Voice* canvassed the opinions of business men and other representative and observant citizens in the State of Rhode Island eight months after the Prohibition repeal of June, 1889. Eighty replies were received to the question, "Do you think the general social and financial condition of the masses has been benefited or otherwise by the return of the license system?" Fifty-six expressed the belief that it had not been benefited (many saying that it had been seriously injured), five said that they observed little or no difference, ten that they were unable to answer and nine that they saw benefits.[1] (In Rhode Island, it will be remembered, the Prohibitory law was not well enforced.)

To give further illustrations of the beneficial workings of Prohibition and the bad effects of license upon the welfare of the masses would be to draw with more or less discrimination upon a fund of information that is inexhaustible. It is unnecessary. The detailed evidences of the general benefits of Prohibition, given in other parts of this article, are sufficiently plentiful; and to reasonable minds they will in each case take the place of specific testimony regarding the improvement of the poor, so apparent is it that any successful anti-liquor policy must operate peculiarly for the elevation of the great class that suffers most from drink.

In bringing this extended review to a close prominence should be given to one conclusion that is suggested to the reflecting person at each stage of the investigation and by each series of facts: it is not as a mere undertaking for the betterment of individual morals, habits or happiness, but as a measure of public policy, that Prohibition is advocated and its results are to be judged. The drink traffic is damaging to individuals, but in each instance the final remedy is to be applied by personal, by temperance and by religious agencies; if the State makes such work easier by removing the temptation, so much the better, but it is not the direct purpose of the State's action to merely correct the vices or the misfortunes of individuals. The traffic injures the State, and on this ground alone Prohibition is urged. If legislated Prohibition is enforced the State is benefited in every essential respect: this is the teaching of reason as well as of all experience. And the advantages do not end with the removal of tippling-places, the diminution of offenses and pauperism, the saving of public money, the wider distribution of private accumulations, the improvement of many branches of legitimate trade and the promotion of virtue and comfort among the people. The purification of politics and the advancement of the cause of better and more intelligent government are results that may also be hoped for. We have but to examine the effects of Prohibition in many noteworthy instances to be assured of this.

The most serious problem of administrative government now before the people of the United States (excepting, perhaps, the problem of creditable government in the cities) is that arising from the race question at the South. The difficulties in that section have invariably been lessened if not wholly ended in localities that have adopted Prohibition and scrupulously enforced it. The county of Copiah, in Mississippi, was formerly notorious for its bloody race conflicts. But in 1884 the State Legislature passed a special act placing Copiah County under Prohibition, and there came a change so marked that the New York *Times* said, July 1, 1886:

> "Copiah has become the most orderly and enlightened county in Mississippi, under a strict enforcement of her Prohibition laws. Money that went formerly to pay for criminal prosecutions now goes to keep open the public schools."[2]

---

[1] The *Voice*, March 6, 1890.

[2] The best judges of Southern conditions agree that the race question is essentially a whiskey question. There is no more prominent or respected organ of Southern public opinion than the St. Louis *Daily Republic*. The *Republic* says (Sept. 21, 1889):

"While there is no election on hand, while we may reasonably expect a hearing for the truth, we wish to re-enforce this presentation of fact by condensing into one word the chief cause of all 'race troubles,' of nearly all crimes committed by negroes and against them, of the negro's poverty, of his failure to secure the respect of respectable people, and of his disorderly habits. The word is 'whiskey.' The negro who gets into trouble with a white man is generally drunk. If he is not, the white man is. They [the negroes] spend every day for whiskey money enough to endow a university and to found a hundred schools. And if this money is not in some way saved for schools the equivalent of it will have to be invested in police clubs and militia rifles. That is 'the negro problem.'"

The Atlanta *Daily Constitution*, also among the foremost journals of the South, adds (Sept. 13, 1889):

"Mean whiskey makes its victims of both races neglect work, and when men are idle and drunk their

The people of the county recognized the blessings of the law, and on the question of its repeal, in 1886, they voted overwhelmingly in the negative, some localities almost unanimously:—for example, the town of Wesson opposed repeal by 280 to 2 and Crystal Springs by 324 to 34.[1] One of the roots of the Southern problem unquestionably springs from the illiteracy and lawlessness of certain elements of the whites, especially in the mountain regions. Rowan County, Ky., has had a most unsavory reputation because of the frequency of murders and other crimes there. An investigating committee of the Legislature of Kentucky, sent to inquire into the situation in Rowan County, said in its report:

> "During all the social chaos since August, 1884, spirituous liquors have been sold with and without license in nearly every part of the county, adding fury and fire and venom to the minds and hearts of murderers, and dragging into the terrible vortex of drunkenness and crime and murder even those who were not originally in the feuds, the proof showing that crimes and murders were committed in the various precincts in proportion to the number of places where whiskey was sold."[2]

On the other hand the mountain counties of Kentucky that enforce Prohibition are practically free from violence and are as progressive as the best rural counties of the country. (For confirmation of this see the *Voice*, May 2, 1889.) Another root of the Southern difficulties is nourished by the improvidence of the negroes. These people, wherever they have seriously tried the Prohibition remedy, have made remarkable advances. The Georgia county of Washington is a typical black county, having had in 1880 a population of 12,515 negroes and 9,449 whites. Previously to 1886 it was under the license system, but in that year it voted for Prohibition. The public records show the following facts:

> "In 1885 there were 1,849 colored polls in the county, owning 5,886 acres of land valued at $19,310, or $3.28 per acre, and that the total taxable property was valued at $107,675, or $58.23 to each colored poll. These figures represent the accumulated savings of the colored people of the county during 20 years of labor under a liquor license system. In 1888, with 1,813 colored polls, the county returned 11,690 acres of land owned by negroes, this land being valued at $54,748, or $4.68 per acre, and the total taxable property of the colored citizens was valued at $149,759, or $82.60 per poll. Further examination of the Comptroller-General's books shows that the number of acres owned by the colored people was 5,886 at the beginning of 1885 (license), 6,001 at the beginning of 1886 (license), 6,046 at the beginning of 1887 (Prohibition) and 11,690 at the beginning of 1888 (Prohibition). Thus in a single year of Prohibition the negroes of Washington County had gained 5,644 acres, nearly as many as they had acquired in the whole of the 20 years of license; and the increased value of their lands per acre showed that they had noticeably improved their homes."[3]

It might be proved from common experience that the solution of most of the other serious problems of local economy and local government, particularly of those gravest problems that are constantly developed by saloon rule and barroom politics in the cities, is prevented under every system of license and regulation, but in Prohibition communities is satisfactorily approached according to the degree of enforcement. But so long as loyalty to Prohibition is not made a recognized test of fealty by party organizations, the temptation to use the law for partisan advantage, by tolerating violations committed by party henchmen, is strong. Upon this consideration the weightiest political objection to a persevering trial of Prohibition is based. Understanding the contempt or unconcern with which practical political managers regard mere principle, and their willingness to use the services of the worst men, many good citizens permit forebodings to master conscience and inclinations, and accordingly supply whatever influence is needed to avert successful results. The fear, or rather the so-called certainty, of non-enforcement in the large cities, is the one thing that gives general plausibility to the claim that Prohibition is still in its experimental stages and of "doubtful utility." Yet we have seen that this fear is very much exaggerated and that there is no element of certainty to confirm it. The results in cities like Topeka, Greeley and Pullman demonstrate that absolute success is possible; in cities like Worcester, Lowell, Lawrence, Cambridge,

---

wrath is easily excited and very slight provocation leads to violence. Of course an outrage, a misunderstanding and certain social and political questions sometimes cause trouble between sober whites and blacks, but in too many instances it cannot be denied that whiskey plays an important part in our race troubles. This phase of the problem deserves serious consideration."

[1] See the *Voice*, July 8, 1886.

[2] Ibid, May 10, 1888.

[3] Ibid, Jan. 3, 1889. (Inaccuracies in some of the figures as given in the *Voice* have been corrected.)

Providence, Atlanta, Raleigh, Charleston (W. Va.), Rockford, Sioux City, Des Moines, Leavenworth and Atchison, that although comparative non-enforcement may ensue it may be believed, even under the most discouraging circumstances, that actual benefits will be reaped. The expediency of making a trial, however hazardous seemingly, becomes less questionable when it is remembered that nothing can be lost by an experiment, that under no form of license (if unassailed testimony is to be trusted) can the evils of the liquor business be abated, and that the erection of a high standard is worth something to humanity and perhaps may be worth much to the cause of the public welfare. When the question is upon the adoption of general rather than local Prohibition there are still stronger reasons for overcoming distrust. It can no longer be doubted that general Prohibitory laws have done much good in all the States that have maintained them, good that is not at all clouded by comparative local failures, since no violations can by any possibility, even locally, increase the evils fostered by the license system. And this brings us to the expression of the final conclusion derived from our study: the general results of Prohibition are beneficial, decidedly so when the Prohibition is genuine and actual; in exceptional and local instances the results are unsatisfactory when measured with the fruits of real Prohibition, but far from unencouraging when compared with the effects of all systems of license.

Prohibition Party.[1]—One of the national political organizations of the United States, established in 1869 on the basis of uncompromising opposition to the drink traffic and to all parties not harmoniously and unmistakably pledged against that traffic, and steadily maintained since then (though with occasional slight changes of name). Its creed is thoroughly defined in the "platforms" adopted by its different National Conventions, all of which are given without abridgment in this article, because of the historical interest attaching to them. Its policy has uniformly been in accord with its aggressive principles: at no time has there been a general disposition to sacrifice its integrity for the sake of a temporary access of influence, and this fact gives it a unique place among so-called "third" parties, for even the Abolition or Liberty party did not preserve its distinct identity without interruption. The strength of the Prohibition party in Presidential campaigns has never exceeded 250,000, but its aggregate vote at State elections has reached nearly 300,000; while it has never secured a majority for its candidates except in small localities, it has frequently held the balance of power in the most important States, withstanding desperate attempts to break down or seduce its following. The results of its agitation are differently interpreted, some believing that they have been positively hurtful to the Prohibition movement and others that they have greatly advanced its best interests in general as well as in detail. This much is not contradicted: the party has always been and is to-day the only national party reliably committed to Prohibition and against license; it has done more than has been accomplished through any other purely political agency to keep the issue constantly before the people; it has often been a menace to the stronger organizations and has disciplined and chastened them in not a few instances; it is supported by a large majority of the representative Prohibition leaders; it has engaged in no discreditable intrigues and its characteristic methods have been honorable and straightforward; its development has unquestionably been attended (from whatever cause) by a concentration of organized sentiment, a great extension of Prohibitory territory and an increasing eagerness among the enemies of the cause to effect compromises.

HISTORY.

In the early struggles for Prohibition (1850–60) it was generally agreed that the policy should stand or fall in accordance with the spontaneously-expressed will of the people, and politicians found few inducements to manipulate or resist public opinion, for the liquor traffic was not a great organized political power. The question whether the Maine law should be adopted in a State was submitted in good faith to the electors for decision, and an affirmative vote was followed by the desired legislation, which was retained on the statute-book as long as there was good reason for believing that a majority of the people—even though a passive majority—would object to its removal. In some States the Legislatures, while wishing to repeal Prohibition and having full authority to arbitrarily do so, were so considerate and cautious as to invite the impartial and uninfluenced judgment of the people before taking the step: as an instance, in Rhode Island the Legislature of 1853 was hostile to the Prohibitory law, but would not venture to disturb it without popular approval, and entirely abandoned its opposition when the people, at the next election, gave an emphatic negative. At times, as in New York and Maine, there were noticeable developments of political antagonism and conspiracy, but these were exceptional. Few Prohibitionists realized in those days that the good cause which they were striving to promote, a cause proposing nothing but the elevation of humanity, would ultimately be sacrificed without mercy by political parties, and that in every battle waged in its behalf the prestige of party influence would be with the foes of morals and good government and the outlaws of society. In the Prohibition literature of that period we find little to suggest the present radical tactics. It is considered a memorable if not an unparalleled circumstance that Rev. Charles F. Deems published, before the war, a newspaper which especially urged the importance of independent political action by the advocates of Prohibition. This journal was printed at Greensburg, N. C., in 1854, and only a few numbers were issued.

---

[1] The editor is indebted to Hon. James Black for many of the historical facts contained in this article. The votes of the Prohibition party for the years 1869–88 are taken from the "Political Prohibitionist." Other election returns are from the *World* and *Tribune* Almanacs.

Origin of the Party.—In the Civil War (1861–5) all political questions save the supreme questions arising from that conflict were lost sight of. The liquor traffic was given a new footing by the Internal Revenue legislation. Brought into political prominence and schooled in political arts by its close relations with the Federal Government, the liquor element gradually asserted itself in State politics. No new Prohibitory measure was enacted at the North during the war. Rhode Island's statute was repealed in 1863, other State laws were weakened and nearly all were flagrantly violated. Soon after the restoration of peace it became evident that the liquor-traffickers were bent on sweeping away, by political operation, all the Prohibitory legislation of the Union. In Massachusetts, the most populous of the Prohibition States, the rumsellers made an aggressive political canvass in 1867, resulting in the election of a Legislature which rescinded the law the next year. In Connecticut, in 1867, an active agitation for repeal was begun. In the same year the National Brewers' Congress (at Chicago, June 5, 1867) adopted the following resolution:

> "*Whereas*, The action and influence of the temperance party is in direct opposition to the principles of individual freedom and political equality upon which our American Union is founded; therefore
>
> "Resolved, That we will use all means to stay the progress of this fanatical party, and to secure our individual rights as citizens, and that we will sustain no candidate, of whatever party, in any election, who is in any way disposed toward the total abstinence cause."

These and other evidences of serious political dangers aroused the Prohibitionists. As early as February, 1867, the State Temperance Convention of Pennsylvania declared that "if the adversaries of temperance shall continue to receive the aid and countenance of present political parties we shall not hesitate to break over political bands and seek redress through the ballot-box." The Grand Lodge of Good Templars of Pennsylvania, at Pittsburgh, June 17, 1867, passed a similar resolution, and the Right Worthy Grand Lodge of Good Templars (the supreme body of the Order), in session at Richmond, Ind., May 28, 1868, recommended "to the temperance people of the country the organization of a national political party whose platform of principles shall contain Prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquor to be used as a beverage." Two months later (July 29 and 30, 1868) the sixth National Temperance Convention (of the series beginning with the Convention of 1833), held at Cleveland, O., made this utterance:

> "Resolved, That temperance, having its political as well as moral aspects and duties,

demands the persistent use of the ballot for its promotion, . . . and we exhort the friends of temperance by every practical method, in their several localities, to secure righteous political action for the advancement of the cause."

The Right Worthy Grand Lodge of Good Templars, when it convened in 1869 (at Oswego, N. Y., May 27), expressed the opinion "That we esteem the present as an auspicious period in the history of our political affairs for the inauguration of this movement, and therefore recommend the calling of a National Convention for the purpose at an early day." On this occasion a meeting of those favoring separate political action was held, with Jonathan H. Orne of Marblehead, Mass., as President, and J. A. Spencer of Cleveland, O., as Secretary. The duty of preparing a call for a National Convention to organize a National Prohibition party was assigned to a committee of five, composed of Rev. John Russell of Detroit, Mich., Prof. Daniel Wilkins of Bloomington, Ill., J. A. Spencer of Cleveland, O., John N. Stearns of New York and James Black of Lancaster, Pa. The call was duly issued, as follows:

"*To the Friends of Temperance, Law and Order in the United States:*

"The moral, social and political evils of intemperance and the non-enforcement of the liquor laws are so fearful and prominent, and the causes thereof are so intrenched and protected by governmental authority and party interest, that the suppression of these evils calls upon the friends of temperance; and the duties connected with home, religion and public peace demand that old political ties and associations shall be sundered, and a distinct political party, with Prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating drinks as the most prominent feature, should be organized.

"The distinctive political issues that have for years past interested the American people are now comparatively unimportant, or fully settled, and in this aspect the time is auspicious for a decided and practical effort to overcome the dread power of the liquor trade.

"The undersigned do therefore earnestly invite all friends of temperance and the enforcement of law, and favorable to distinct political action for the promotion of the same, to meet in general mass convention in the city of Chicago, on Wednesday, the 1st day of September, 1869, at 11 o'clock A. M., for the purpose of organizing for distinct political action for temperance.

"All churches, Sunday-schools and temperance societies of all names are requested to send delegates, and all persons favorable to this movement are invited to meet at the time and place above stated.

"R. M. Foust (Philadelphia, Pa.), J. H. Orne (Marblehead, Mass.), Joshua Wadsworth (Cincinnati, O.), S. W. Hodges (Boston, Mass.), J. A. Spencer (Cleveland, O.), R. C. Bull (Philadelphia, Pa.), H. D. Cushing (Boston, Mass.), Rev. Peter Stryker, D.D. (Philadelphia, Pa.), Joshua Nye (Waterville, Me.), Rev. Samuel McKean (Cambridge, N. Y.), T. M. Van Court (Chicago, Ill.), Rev. J. G. D. Stearns (Clearwater, Minn.), William Hargreaves, M.D. (Reading, Pa.), D. W. Gage (Ames, Ia.), Rev. J. C. Stoughton (Chicago, Ill.), P. Mason (Somerville, N. J.), Rev. Edwin Thompson (Boston, Mass.), Rev. Elnathan Davis (Fitchburg, Mass.), Ebenezer Bowman (Taunton, Mass.), B. E. Hale (Brooklyn, N. Y.), J. F. Forbes (Cincinnati, O.), Samuel Foljambe (Cleveland, O.), L. B. Silver (Salem, O.), O. P. Downs (Warsaw, Ind.), G. N. Jones (Chicago, Ill.), Dr. C. H. Merrick (Cleveland, O.), Jay Odell (Cleveland, O.), Rev. William C. Hendrickson (Bristol, Pa.), Enoch Passmore (Kennett Square, Pa.), Neal Dow (Portland, Me.), Rev. John Russell (Detroit, Mich.), James Black (Lancaster, Pa.), Charles Jewett (Pomona, Tenn.), Rev. James B. Dunn (Boston, Mass.), Rev. George Lansing Taylor (New York City), John O'Donnell (Lowville, N. Y.), Rev. William M. Thayer (Franklin, Mass.), Rev. N. E. Cobleigh, D.D. (Athens, Tenn.), Peterfield Trent, M.D. (Richmond, Va.), J. N. Stearns (New York City), Rev. William Hosmer (Auburn, N. Y.), Rev. S. H. Platt (Brooklyn, N. Y.), S. T. Montgomery (Indianapolis, Ind.), Rev. G. H. Ball (Buffalo, N. Y.), George P. Burwell (Cleveland, O.), G. N. Abbey (Cleveland, O.), Luther S. Kauffman (Minersville, Pa.), A. T. Proctor (Cleveland, O.), George S. Tambling, Jr. (Cleveland, O.), H. V. Horton (Cincinnati, O.), Rev. Moses Smith (Xenia, O.), Gen. J. S. Smith (Kingston, N. Y.), T. P. Hunt Wilkesbarre, Pa.), D. R. Pershing (Warsaw, Ind.), George Gabel (Philadelphia, Pa.), William H. Fries (Clifton, Pa.), S. J. Coffin (Easton, Pa.)."

From 1869 *to* 1872.—The organizing Convention met in Farwell Hall, Chicago, on the specified day (Sept. 1, 1869), with nearly 500 delegates in attendance, from the States of California, Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Minnesota, Massachusetts, Maine, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Vermont and Wisconsin, and the District of Columbia. John Russell of Michigan was Temporary Chairman, James Black of Pennsylvania was Permanent Chairman, and J. A. Spencer of Ohio was Secretary. It was voted to publish an address to the people of the United States, prepared by Hon. Gerrit Smith of New York. At first it was decided to call the new organization the Anti-Dramshop party, but the Convention finally named it the National Prohibition party. The following is the text of the platform of principles adopted:

"*Whereas*, Protection and allegiance are reciprocal duties, and every citizen who yields obedience to the just commands of his Government is entitled to the full, free and perfect protection of that Government in the enjoyment of personal security, personal liberty and private property; and

"*Whereas*, The traffic in intoxicating drinks greatly impairs the personal security and personal liberty of a large mass of citizens, and renders private property insecure; and

"*Whereas*, The existing parties are hopelessly unwilling to adopt an adequate policy on this question; therefore

"We, in National Convention assembled, as citizens of this free Republic, sharing the duties and responsibilities of its Government, in discharge of a solemn duty we owe to our country and our race, unite in the following declaration of principles:

"1. That while we acknowledge the pure patriotism and profound statesmanship of those patriots who laid the foundations of this Government, securing at once the rights of the States severally, and their inseparable union by the Federal Constitution, we would not merely garnish the sepulchers of our republican fathers, but we do hereby renew our solemn pledges of fealty to the imperishable principles of civil and religious liberty embodied in the Declaration of American Independence and our Federal Constitution.

"2. That the traffic in intoxicating beverages is a dishonor to Christian civilization, inimical to the best interests of society, a political wrong of unequalled enormity, subversive of the ordinary objects of government, not capable of being regulated or restrained by any system of license whatever, but imperatively demanding for its suppression effective legal Prohibition, both by State and National legislation.

"3. That in view of this, and inasmuch as the existing political parties either oppose or ignore this great and paramount question, and absolutely refuse to do anything toward the suppression of the rum traffic, which is robbing the nation of its brightest intellects, destroying internal prosperity and rapidly undermining its very foundations, we are driven by an imperative sense of duty to sever our connection with these political parties and organize ourselves into a National Prohibition party, having for its primary object the entire suppression of the traffic in intoxicating drinks.

"4. That while we adopt the name of the National Prohibition party, as expressive of our primary object, and while we denounce all repudiation of the public debt and pledge fidelity to the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution, we deem it not expedient at present to give prominence to other political issues.

"5. That while we recognize the good providence of Almighty God in supervising the interests of this nation from its establishment to the present time, we would not, in organizing our party for the legal prohibition of the liquor traffic, forget that our reliance for ultimate success must be upon the same omnipotent arm.

"6. That a Central Executive Committee, of one from each State and Territory and the District of Columbia, be appointed by the Chair, whose duty it shall be to take such action as, in their judgment, will best promote the interests of the party."

At the fall elections of 1869 Ohio was the only State returning votes for the Prohibition party as a distinct organization, 679 being reported from that State. But Maine and Minnesota each cast votes for "Republican-Prohibition" candidates—the former 4,743 and the latter 1,761.

In 1870 support was received at the polls in six States, as follows: Illinois, 3,712; Massachusetts (Lieutenant-Governor), 8,692; Michigan, 2,170; New Hampshire, 1,167; New York, 1,459; Ohio, 2,812—total, 20,012. In Massachusetts the Prohibition candidate for Governor this year was Wendell Phillips, and, being indorsed by the Labor party and independent Republicans, he polled 21,946 votes—many more than were cast for the other candidates of the Prohibitionists. Yet the distinctive Prohibition vote of that State—nearly 8,700—was large when it is remembered that this was the first year in which the party took the field; it was cast as a protest against the repeal of the Massachusetts Prohibitory law in 1868 and the beer-exemption clauses of the re-enacted statute of 1869. There is nothing specially interesting in the developments in other States in 1870, except that in New York the candidate for Governor was Myron H. Clark, who had been elected Governor on the Maine law issue in 1854.[1]

---

[1] Governor Clark's election was secured in this way: The New York Legislature of 1853 passed a Prohibitory law, which Governor Horatio Seymour (Dem.) vetoed. This veto aroused strong feeling, and the State Temperance Convention which met at Auburn, Sept. 29, 1853, decided to take the question into politics, declaring in its resolutions: "We advocate and will labor for the enactment of a law prohibiting the traffic in intoxicating beverages. . . . We regard the enactment of such a law as the greatest and most vital issue in State politics, and we cannot subordinate this question to any other nor defer its settlement to any more convenient season. . . . We ask a Legislature that will enact such a law, a Governor who will approve and magistrates and other officers who will enforce it." The re-enactment of the vetoed bill was a leading issue in the election for Governor in 1854, and the vote was as follows: Myron H. Clark (Whig, Temp., Free Dem. and Rep., on a strong Prohibition platform), 156,804; Horatio Seymour (Dem., on an anti Prohibition platform), 156,495; Ullman (Know-Nothing, personally opposed to Prohibition, though the platform of his party was silent in regard to the question), 122,282; Bronson (Hardshell Dem., opposed to Prohibition), 35,850—Clark's plurality, 309. The Prohibitory bill was passed again by the Legislature of 1855, and Governor Clark signed it, but after it had been in force for a few months it was pronounced unconstitutional in

Only a few of the States held elections in 1871. Five returned Prohibition votes: Massachusetts, 6,598; New Hampshire, 314; New York, 1,820; Ohio, 4,084, and Pennsylvania, 3,186—total, 16,002. In Massachusetts Judge Robert C. Pitman headed the ticket, and by retaining nearly the whole of the previous year's strength demonstrated to the politicians that the new movement was founded on something more serious than a momentary outburst. In New York the party took the name of "Anti-Dramshop." In Pennsylvania it appeared for the first time.

From 1872 *to* 1876.—The first National Nominating Convention was held on Washington's Birthday (Feb. 22) in 1872, at Columbus, O. It was called to order by Rev. John Russell, Chairman of the National Committee, and the States of California, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania and West Virginia, with the District of Columbia, were represented by delegates. The officers were: Temporary Chairman, Henry Fish of Michigan; Permanent Chairman, S. B. Chase of Pennsylvania; Secretaries, Elroy M. Avery of Ohio, G. F. McFarland of Pennsylvania and J. W. Nichols of Illinois. James Black of Pennsylvania and John Russell of Michigan were unanimously nominated for President and Vice-President, respectively, and this platform was adopted:

"RESOLVED, That we reaffirm the following resolutions adopted by the National Prohibition Convention, held at Chicago, Sept. 2, 1869:

"'*Whereas*, Protection and allegiance are reciprocal duties, and every citizen who yields obedience to the just commands of the Government is entitled to the full, free and perfect protection of that Government in the enjoyment of personal security, personal liberty and private property; and

"'*Whereas*, The traffic in intoxicating drinks greatly impairs the personal security and personal liberty of a large mass of citizens, and renders private property insecure; and

"'*Whereas*, All other political parties are hopelessly unwilling to adopt an adequate policy on this question; therefore

"'We, in National Convention assembled, as citizens of this free Republic, sharing the duties and responsibilities of its Government, in discharge of a solemn duty we owe to our country and our race, unite in the following declaration of principles:

"'1. That while we acknowledge the pure patriotism and profound statesmanship of those patriots who laid the foundations of this Government, securing at once the rights of the States severally, and their inseparable union by the Federal Constitution, we would not merely garnish the sepulchers of our republican fathers, but we do hereby renew our solemn pledges of fealty to the imperishable principles of civil and religious liberty embodied in the Declaration of American Independence and our Federal Constitution.

"'2. That the traffic in intoxicating beverages is a dishonor to Christian civilization, inimical to the best interests of society, a political wrong of unequalled enormity, subversive of the ordinary objects of government, not capable of being regulated or restrained by any system of license whatever, but imperatively demanding for its suppression effective legal Prohibition by both State and National legislation.'

"3. That while we recognize the good providence of Almighty God in supervising the interests of this nation from its establishment to the present time, having organized our party for the legal Prohibition of the liquor traffic, our reliance for success is upon the same omnipotent arm.

"4. That there can be no greater peril to the nation than the existing party competition for the liquor vote; that any party not openly opposed to the traffic, experience shows, will engage in this competition, will court the favor of the criminal classes, will barter away the public morals, the purity of the ballot, and every object of good government, for party success.

"5. That while adopting national political measures for the Prohibition of the liquor traffic, we will continue the use of all moral means in our power to persuade men away from the injurious practice of using intoxicating beverages.

"6. That we invite all persons, whether total abstainers or not, who recognize the terrible injuries inflicted by the liquor traffic, to unite with us for its overthrow, and to secure thereby peace, order and the protection of persons and property.

"7. That competency, honesty and sobriety are indispensable qualifications for holding public office.

"8. That removals from public service for mere difference of political opinion is a practice opposed to sound policy and just principles.

"9. That fixed and moderate salaries should take the place of official fees and perquisites; the franking privilege, sinecures, and all unnecessary offices and expenses should be abolished, and every possible means be employed to prevent corruption and venality in office; and by a rigid system of accountability from all its officers, and guards over the public treasury, the utmost economy should be practiced and enforced in every department of the Government.

"10. That we favor the election of President, Vice-President and United States Senators by direct vote of the people.

"11. That we are in favor of a sound national currency, adequate to the demands of business and convertible into gold and silver at the will of the holder, and the adoption of every measure compatible with justice and the public safety, to appreciate our present currency to the gold standard.

"12. That the rates of inland and ocean postage, of telegraphic communication, of railroad and water transportation and travel, should be reduced to the lowest practicable point, by force of laws wisely and justly framed, with reference not only to the interest of capital employed but to the higher claim of the general good.

---

certain provisions by the Court of Appeals. The Legislature of 1856 was the first one in New York that the Republican party controlled in both branches, and it passed a license law. (See the "Political Prohibitionist for 1887," p. 100.)

"13. That an adequate public revenue being necessary, it may properly be raised by impost duties and by an equitable assessment upon the property and legitimate business of the country; nevertheless we are opposed to any discrimination of capital against labor, as well as to all monopoly and class legislation.

"14. That the removal of the burdens, moral, physical, pecuniary and social, imposed by the traffic in intoxicating drinks will, in our judgment, emancipate labor and practically thus promote labor reform.

"15. That the fostering and extension of common schools under the care and support of the State, to supply the want of a general and liberal education, is a primary duty of a good government.

"16. That the right of suffrage rests on no mere circumstance of color, race, former social condition, sex or nationality, but inheres in the nature of man; and when from any cause it has been withheld from citizens of our country who are of suitable age and mentally and morally qualified for the discharge of its duties, it should be speedily restored by the people in their sovereign capacity.[1]

"17. That a liberal and just policy should be pursued to promote foreign immigration to our shores, always allowing to the naturalized citizens equal rights, privileges and protection under the Constitution with those who are native-born."

The following table gives the Presidential vote of the party in 1872 and the vote at State elections in 1873, 1874 and 1875:

STATES.	PRESIDENT, 1872.	1873.	1874.	1875.
California	....	....	....	356
Connecticut	205	2,541	4,960	2,932
Illinois	....	....	516	....
Kansas	....	....	2,277	....
Massachusetts	....	....	....	9,124
Michigan	1,271	....	3,937	....
Minnesota	....	1,050	....	1,600
Nebraska	....	....	1,346	....
New Hampshire	200	1,779	2,100	773
New York	201	3,272	11,768	11,103
Ohio	2,100	10,081	7,815	2,593
Pennsylvania	1,630	....	4,632	13,244
Wisconsin	....	....	....	460
Totals	5,607	18,723	39,351	42,185

Popular vote for President in 1872: Grant (Rep.), 3,597,070; Greeley (Liberal Rep. and Dem.), 2,834,079; O'Conor (straight Dem.), 29,408; Black (Proh.), 5,607.

In the campaign of 1872 the Prohibitionists made no efforts to secure votes. Electoral tickets were nominated in only six States. Even Massachusetts, which had given the party thousands on State issues in 1870 and 1871, refused to recognize it as a national organization. The candidacy of Horace Greeley, whose Prohibition record was well-known, and the Raster resolution of the Republicans (see REPUBLICAN PARTY), probably operated to reduce the natural strength of Black and Russell. In this year, at the State elections, 1,542 votes were obtained in Connecticut and 478 in New Hampshire.

The returns for 1873 have several interesting features. Connecticut cast 2,541 Prohibition votes, the rise of the party there being due to the repeal of the Prohibitory law in 1872. In Massachusetts the formidable vote of former years was wholly wiped out: this is explained by the action of the Legislature, in the spring of 1873, in putting an end to the exemption of beer and thus restoring the effectiveness of the Prohibitory law. In New York there was a noticeable increase, caused probably by Governor Dix's veto of the Local Option bill in that year and the consequent repudiation of a pledge made by the Republican party. In Ohio the large vote of 10,081 was an indication of the rising sentiment that flamed out a few months later in the Woman's Crusade.

The year 1874 was a notable one in American politics. In consequence of the panic of 1873 and a general dissatisfaction with Grant's Administration the Democrats secured a large majority in the House of Representatives at the Congressional elections. There was a loosening of party ties, from which the new party profited. The number of States contributing votes to it was increased to nine. Special influences were at work in several States. In Connecticut and New York the discontent of the Prohibitionists expressed at the polls in the preceding year was emphasized. In Pennsylvania the avowed purpose of the liquor element to choose a Legislature that would destroy the Local Option law stimulated the radical Prohibitionists. In Ohio, despite the Woman's Crusade and the submission of a License Amendment to the Constitution, there was a decline; but the vote was large, considering that only unimportant State officers were chosen in 1874 and that the License Amendment plot was a device of the Democratic party and therefore brought much temperance support to the Republican ticket.

Comparatively few States held elections in 1875, but the Prohibition party had a following in nine States, and its aggregate vote reached the respectable figure of 42,185. Of this vote more than 33,000 came from New York, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. The resentment of the temperance people in New York was unabated. In Pennsylvania the co-operation of the Republicans with the Democrats in repealing the Local Option act brought thousands of recruits to the Prohibition party. The reappearance of the party in Massachusetts was occasioned by the repeal of the Prohibitory law in that year. In Connecticut a disposition was shown to accept the situation.

---

[1] This resolution gave rise to prolonged debate. A motion was made to strike out the word "sex," but only 22 voted in support of it.

Throughout these early years of independent political agitation, and for nearly ten years more, there was practically no general acceptance of the claims of the National Prohibition party. Operations were confined to separate States, and the results gained, while promising in a number of cases, were temporary and were not followed up. The election returns frequently describe the Prohibition votes of this period as "Temperance" or "Anti-Dramshop." In Rhode Island the Prohibition question changed the face of politics for several years. A Legislature and a Governor friendly to Prohibition were chosen in 1874, and a Prohibitory law was accordingly enacted. A conspiracy to annul it was immediately instituted, and the parties were split into factions for and against repeal. In 1875, on the question of repeal, three candidates for Governor were nominated, and the candidate committed to the retention of the measure (Howard, Republican and Prohibitionist) received a plurality, but the liquor men carried the Legislature and seated an anti-Prohibition Governor. The political complications growing out of the developments of 1875 continued until 1880, and in each year the Prohibition element polled a heavy vote, ranging above 6,000.

Renewed interest in the general aspects of the party cause was shown in 1875, when a National Conference of the Prohibition party was held at Sea Cliff, N. Y. (July 13). S. B. Chase of Pennsylvania presided.

From 1876 *to* 1880.—More than 100 delegates, representing the States of Connecticut, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin, were in attendance at the second National Nominating Convention, which met in Cleveland on the 17th of May, 1876. Gen. Green Clay Smith of Kentucky was the Temporary Chairman and Rev. H. A. Thompson of Ohio the Permanent Chairman; the Secretaries were Charles P. Russell of Michigan and J. O. Brayman of Illinois. Green Clay Smith of Kentucky was nominated for President and Gideon T. Stewart of Ohio for Vice-President. An address to the people of the United States, prepared by John Russell, was adopted and the publication of it was ordered. James Black of Pennsylvania was made Chairman and John Russell of Michigan Secretary of the National Committee. "The National Prohibition Reform Party" was substituted for the old name. The platform was as follows:

"The Prohibition Reform party of the United States, organized in the name of the people to revive, enforce and perpetuate in the Government the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence, submit in this Centennial year of the Republic for the suffrages of all good citizens the following platform of national reforms and measures:

"1. The legal Prohibition in the District of Columbia, the Territories and in every other place subject to the laws of Congress, of the importation, exportation, manufacture and traffic of all alcoholic beverages, as high crimes against society; an Amendment of the National Constitution to render these Prohibitory measures universal and permanent, and the adoption of treaty stipulations with foreign Powers to prevent the importation and exportation of all alcoholic beverages.

"2. The abolition of class legislation and of special privileges in the Government, and the adoption of equal suffrage and eligibility to office without distinction of race, religious creed, property or sex.

"3. The appropriation of the public lands in limited quantities to actual settlers only; the reduction of the rates of inland and ocean postage, of telegraphic communication, of railroad and water transportation and travel to the lowest practical point by force of laws, wisely and justly framed, with reference not only to the interests of capital employed but to the higher claims of the general good.

"4. The suppression, by law, of lotteries and gambling in gold, stocks, produce and every form of money and property, and the penal inhibition of the use of the public mails for advertising schemes of gambling and lotteries.

"5. The abolition of those foul enormities, polygamy and the social evil, and the protection of purity, peace and happiness of homes by ample and efficient legislation.

"6. The national observance of the Christian Sabbath, established by laws prohibiting ordinary labor and business in all departments of public service and private employments (works of necessity, charity and religion excepted) on that day.

"7. The establishment by mandatory provisions in National and State Constitutions, and by all necessary legislation, of a system of free public schools for the universal and forced education of all the youth of the land.

"8. The free use of the Bible, not as a ground of religious creeds, but as a text-book of purest morality, the best liberty and the noblest literature, in our public schools, that our children may grow up in its light and that its spirit and principles may pervade our nation.

"9. The separation of the Government in all its departments and institutions, including the public schools and all funds for their maintenance, from the control of every religious sect or other association, and the protection alike of all sects by equal laws, with entire freedom of religious faith and worship.

"10. The introduction into all treaties, hereafter negotiated with foreign Governments, of a provision for the amicable settlement of international difficulties by arbitration.

"11. The abolition of all barbarous modes and instruments of punishment; the recognition of the laws of God and the claims of humanity in the discipline of jails and prisons, and of that higher and wiser civilization worthy of our age and nation, which regards the reform of criminals as a means for the prevention of crime.

"12. The abolition of executive and legislative patronage, and the election of President, Vice-President, United States Senators, and of all civil officers, so far as practicable, by the direct vote of the people.

"13. The practice of a friendly and liberal policy to immigrants from all nations, the guaranty to them of ample protection and of equal rights and privileges.

"14. The separation of the money of Government from all banking institutions. The National Government only should exercise the high prerogative of issuing paper money, and that should be subject to prompt redemption on demand, in gold and silver, the only equal standards of value recognized by the civilized world.

"15. The reduction of the salaries of public officers in a just ratio with the decline of wages and market prices, the abolition of sinecures, unnecessary offices and official fees and perquisites; the practice of strict economy in Government expenses, and a free and thorough investigation into any and all alleged abuses of public trusts."

Without resources or encouragement, the party conducted no canvass in 1876. This was the exciting Tilden-Hayes year, and electors were especially unwilling to break away from their old parties. But the Prohibition vote, though light, was distributed over 18 States, twice as many States as had furnished support in any former year. The votes for State officers in 1876 were: Kansas, 393; Massachusetts (Proh. and Greenb.), 12,274; Michigan, 874; New Hampshire, 425; New York, 3,412; Ohio, 1,863—total, 19,241.

Below are the votes by States for President in 1876 and State candidates in 1877, 1878 and 1879:

STATES.	PRESIDENT, 1876.	1877.	1878.	1879.
Connecticut	378	....	1,079	....
Illinois	141	....	2,228	....
Indiana	38	....	....	....
Iowa	36	10,545	....	3,258
Kansas	110	....	....	....
Kentucky	818	....	....	....
Maryland	10	....	....	....
Massachusetts	84	16,354	1,913	1,645
Michigan	767	....	3,469	....
Minnesota	144	....	....	2,868
Missouri	64	....	....	....
Nebraska	1,599	....	....	....
New Hampshire	....	....	85	....
New Jersey	43	1,438	....	....
New York	2,329	7,230	4,294	4,437
Ohio	1,636	4,836	5,682	4,145
Pennsylvania	1,319	2,827	3,759	3,219
Rhode Island	68	....	....	....
Wisconsin	153	....	....	387
Totals	9,737	43,230	22,509	19,959

Popular vote for President in 1876: Tilden (Dem.), 4,285.992; Hayes (Rep.), 4,033,950; Cooper (Greenb.), 81,737; Smith (Proh.), 9,737.

The intention of continuing the national struggle was shown in 1877, when a National Conference of the party was held in New York City (Sept. 26 and 27).

The elections of 1877 were signalized by votes of 10,545 in Iowa (a State that had ignored the movement) and 16,354 in Massachusetts. Iowa's action proved to be of far-reaching importance; the bold step taken by her Prohibitionists alarmed the Republican leaders and prepared the way for the Constitutional Amendment agitation and the subsequent submission and legislation. (See p. 105.) The Massachusetts temperance people made a stronger protest than they had done before against the repeal of the Prohibitory law, Judge Pitman being again their candidate for Governor. New Jersey for the first time vouchsafed votes for the party Prohibitionists. In Pennsylvania the failure to regain ground indicated that the revolt of 1875 was to be without effect. New York and Ohio, while not touching the marks registered in former years, showed a disposition to steadily maintain the party organization, a disposition that was adhered to in these States, as well as in Pennsylvania, in 1878 and 1879.

The aggregate votes of the party were smaller in 1878 and 1879 than they had been in any year (excepting 1876) since 1873. There was a subsidence in all the important States excepting Illinois, Michigan and Minnesota. In Connecticut the vote sank below that given at the State election of 1872. In Iowa the election of 1878 was for minor State officers and the Prohibitionists did not participate in it, but in 1879, at the Gubernatorial and legislative elections, while not holding their strength of 1877 they again convinced the political managers that it would be unwise to resist their demands.

From 1880 *to* 1884.—The third National Nominating Convention, at Cleveland, June 17, 1880, contained 142 delegates from the States of Arkansas, Connecticut, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia and Wisconsin. Rev. H. A. Thompson of Ohio presided as Temporary Chairman and Rev. A. A. Miner, D.D., of Massachusetts, as Permanent Chairman, with Mrs. Mary A. Woodbridge of Ohio, Mrs. Mattie McClellan Brown, George Erwin of Pennsylvania, D. P. Sagendorph of Michigan, Mrs. E. M. J. Cooley of Wisconsin and Mrs. A. J. Gordon of Massachusetts as Secretaries. Neal Dow of Maine was nominated for President and Rev. H. A. Thompson of Ohio for Vice-President. Below is the platform:

"The Prohibition Reform party of the United States, organized in the name of the people to revive, enforce and perpetuate in the Government the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence, submit for the suffrages of all good citizens the following platform of national reforms and measures:

"1. In the examination and discussion of the temperance question it has been proven, and is an accepted truth, that alcoholic drinks, whether fermented, brewed or distilled, are poisonous to the healthy human body, the drinking of which is not only needless but hurtful, necessarily tending to form intemperate habits, increasing greatly the number, severity and fatal termination of diseases, weakening and deranging the intellect, polluting the affections, hardening the heart and corrupting the morals, depriving many of reason and still more of its healthful exercise, and annually bringing down large numbers to untimely graves, producing in the children of many who drink a predisposition to intemperance, insanity and various bodily and mental diseases, causing a diminution of strength, feebleness of vision, fickleness of purpose and premature old age, and producing to all future generations a deterioration of moral and physical character. The legalized importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks minister to their uses and teach the erroneous and destructive sentiment that such use is right, thus tending to produce and perpetuate the above-mentioned evils. Alcoholic drinks are thus the implacable enemy of man as an individual.

"2. That the liquor traffic is to the home equally an enemy, proving a disturber and a destroyer of its peace, prosperity and happiness, taking from it the earnings of the husband, depriving the dependent wife and children of essential food, clothing and education, bringing into it profanity and abuse, setting at naught the vows of the marriage altar, breaking up the family and sundering children from parents, and thus destroying one of the most beneficent institutions of our Creator, and removing the sure foundation for good government, national prosperity and welfare.

"3. That to the community it is equally an enemy, producing demoralization, vice and wickedness; its places of sale being often resorts for gambling, lewdness and debauchery, and the hiding places of those who prey upon society, counteracting the efficacy of religious effort and of all means for the intellectual elevation, moral purity, social happiness and the eternal good of mankind, without rendering any counteracting or compensating benefits, being in its influence and effect evil and only evil, and that continually.

"4. That to the State it is equally an enemy, legislative inquiry, judicial investigation and the official reports of all penal, reformatory and dependent institutions showing that the manufacture and sale of such beverages is the promoting cause of intemperance, crime and pauperism, of demands upon public and private charity; imposing the larger part of taxation, thus paralyzing thrift, industry, manufacture and commercial life, which but for it would be unnecessary; disturbing the peace of the streets and highways; filling prisons and poorhouses; corrupting politics, legislation and the execution of the laws; shortening lives, diminishing health, industry and productive power in manufacture and art; and is manifestly unjust as well as injurious to the community upon which it is imposed, and contrary to all just views of civil liberty, as well as a violation of a fundamental maxim of our common law to use your own property or liberty so as not to injure others.

"5. That it is neither right nor politic for the State to afford legal protection to any traffic or system which tends to waste the resources, to corrupt the social habits and to destroy the health and lives of the people; that the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages is proven to be inimical to the true interests of the individual, the home, the community, the State, and destructive to the order and welfare of society, and ought, therefore, to be classed among crimes to be prohibited.

"6. That in this time of profound peace at home and abroad the entire separation of the general Government from the drink traffic, and its Prohibition in the District of Columbia, the

Territories and in all places and ways over which (under the Constitution) Congress has control or power, is a political issue of first importance to the peace and prosperity of the nation. There can be no stable peace and protection to personal liberty, life or property until secured by National and State Constitutional Prohibition enforced by adequate laws.

"7. That all legitimate industries require deliverance from taxation and loss which the liquor traffic imposes upon them, and financial or other legislation can not accomplish so much to increase production and cause demand for labor, and as a result, for the comfort of living, as the suppression of this traffic would bring to thousands of homes as one of its blessings.

"8. That the administration of Government and the execution of the laws being by and through political parties, we arraign the Republican party, which has been in continuous power in the nation for 20 years, as being false to its duty, as false to its loudly-proclaimed principles of 'equal justice to all and special favors to none,' and of protection to the weak and dependent; and that through moral cowardice it has been and is unable to correct the mischief which the trade in liquor has constantly inflicted upon the industrial interests, commerce and social happiness of the people. On the contrary, its subjection to and complicity with the liquor interest appears: (1) By the facts that 5,652 distilleries, 2,830 breweries, and 175,266 places of sale of the poisonous liquors, involving an annual waste, direct and indirect, to the nation of $1,500,000,000, and a sacrifice of 100,000 lives, have under its legislation grown up and been fostered as a legitimate source of revenue; (2) That during its history six Territories have been organized and five States admitted into the Union with Constitutions provided and approved by Congress, but the Prohibition of this debasing and destructive traffic has not been provided for, nor even the people given at the time of admission the power to forbid it in any one of them; (3) That its history further shows that not in a single instance has an original Prohibitory law been enacted in any State controlled by it, while in four States so governed the laws found on its advent to power have been repealed; (4) That at its National Convention of 1872 it declared as a part of its party faith that 'it disapproves of a resort to unconstitutional laws for the purpose of removing evils by interference with the right not surrendered by the people to either State or National Government,' which the author of this plank says 'was adopted by the Platform Committee with the full and explicit understanding that its purpose was the discountenancing of all so-called temperance (Prohibitory) and Sunday laws;' (5) That notwithstanding the deep interest felt by the people during the last quadrennium in the legal suppression of the drink curse, shown by many forms of public expression, this party at its last National Convention, held in Chicago during the present month, in making new promises by its platform, says not one word on this question, nor holds out any hope of relief.

"9. That we arraign also the Democratic party as unfaithful and unworthy of reliance on this question; for although not clothed with power, but occupying the relation of the opposition party during 20 years past, strong in number and organization, it has allied itself with the liquor-traffickers and has become in all the States of the Union their special political defenders. In its National Convention in 1876, as an article of its political faith, it declared against Prohibition and just laws in restraint of the trade in drink by saying it was opposed to what it was pleased to call 'all sumptuary laws.' The National party[1] has been dumb on the question.

"10. That the drink-traffickers, realizing that history and experience, in all ages, climes and conditions of men declare their business destructive of all good, and finding no support from the Bible, morals or reason, appeal to misapplied law for their justification, and entrench themselves behind the evil elements of political party for defense, party tactics and party inertia having become the battling forces protecting this evil.

"11. That in view of the foregoing facts and history, we cordially invite all voters, without regard to former party affiliation, to unite with us in the use of the ballot for the abolition of the drink system now existing under the authority of our National and State Governments. We also demand as a right that women, having in other respects the privileges of citizens, shall be clothed with the ballot for their protection, and as a rightful means for a proper settlement of the liquor question.

"12. That to remove the apprehensions of some who allege that loss of public revenue would follow the suppression of the drink trade, we confidently point to the experience of government abroad and at home, which shows that thrift and revenue from consumption of legitimate manufactures and commerce have so largely followed the abolition of the drink as to fully supply all loss of liquor taxes.

"13. That we recognize the good providence of Almighty God, who has preserved and prospered us as a nation, and, asking for his spirit to guide us to ultimate success, we will look for it, relying upon his omnipotent arm."

Votes of 1880–3:

STATES.	PRES., 1880.	1881.	1882.	1883.
California	61	....	5,772	....
Connecticut	409	....	1,034	....
Illinois	443	....	11,344	....
Iowa	592	....	....	....
Kentucky	258	....	4,392	....
Maine	93	....	387	....
Massachusetts	682	1,040	2,137	1,881
Michigan	942	12,774	5,854	13,950
Minnesota	286	708	....	4,924
New Hampshire	180	....	345	....
New Jersey	191	....	2,004[1]	4,153
New York	1,517	4,445	25,783	18,816
Ohio	2,616	16,597	12,202	8,362
Pennsylvania	1,319	4,507	5,196	6,602
Rhode Island	20	253	....	....
Wisconsin	69	7,002	13,800[1]	....
Totals	9,678	47,326	90,250	58,688

[1] Aggregates on Congressmen.

Popular vote for President in 1880: Garfield (Rep.), 4,454,416; Hancock (Dem.), 4,444,952; Weaver (Greenb.), 308,578; Dow (Proh.), 9,678.

---

[1] Another name for the Greenback-Labor party.

Sixteen States gave votes in 1880 as against 18 in 1876. Again the party was too feeble to make a formal campaign. Just before the election the report was widely published that Mr. Dow had withdrawn. To announce the retirement of Prohibitionist nominees is always a favorite device of not over-scrupulous politicians. Votes for State candidates in 1880: Connecticut, 488; Massachusetts, 1,059; Michigan, 1,114; New Jersey, 195; Ohio, 2,815; Pennsylvania, 1,898—total, 7,489. (It is probable, however, that this list does not include all the States that ran tickets.)

The years 1881 and 1882 mark a new epoch in the history of the national organization. At the Lake Bluff Convocation (held near Chicago) in August, 1881, some of the influential Prohibition leaders who had not been very actively identified with the party or had held aloof from it decided to secure, if possible, a more vigorous championship and a stronger support for it. George W. Bain of Kentucky, A. J. Jutkins of Illinois, Miss Frances E. Willard of Illinois and R. W. Nelson of Illinois were appointed a committee to organize a so-called "Home Protection party" as "a political party whose platform is based on Constitutional and statutory Prohibition of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages in the State and nation." A call for a National Convention, joined in by the others interested, was issued, and the body met in Farwell Hall, Chicago, Aug. 23 and 24, 1882, 341 delegates being present from 22 States. Theodore D. Kanouse of Wisconsin presided and Mrs. Mary A. Woodbridge of Ohio was Secretary. A new name, the "Prohibition Home Protection Party," was adopted, and the National Committee was reorganized with Gideon T. Stewart of Ohio as Chairman, A. J. Jutkins of Illinois as Secretary and Samuel D. Hastings of Wisconsin as Treasurer. The platform adopted was comparatively brief. It was as follows:

"All questions not of a national character belong to the party within the several States and Territories to define its views, policy and action respecting them, not inconsistent with this national platform.

"We declare in favor of the following national principles and measures, to be incorporated in the National Constitution and enforced by Congress and the Government;

"1. The prohibition, as public crimes, of the importation, exportation, manufacture, sale and supply of all alcoholic beverages.

"2. The prohibition of all taxation, license, regulation and legal sanction in any form of these or any other public crimes.

"3. The civil and political equality and enfranchisement of women. This reform, so far as concerns the States severally, is remitted to the party in those States.

"4. The abolition of polygamy.

"5. The abolition of executive, judicial and legislative patronage, and election of all officers by the people as far as practicable, and civil service reform in other appointments.

"6. The abolition of sinecures and unnecessary offices.

"7. The universal and enforced education of the youth of the nation (including instruction in regard to the effects of alcohol on the human body), with ample provision for the support of an adequate and efficient system of free public schools in all the States and Territories.

"8. The preservation of the public lands for homes for the people, and their division in limited portions to actual settlers only.

"9. The abolition of all monopolies, class legislation and special privileges from Government injurious to the equal rights of citizens.

"10. The control of railroad and other corporations, to prevent abuses of power and to protect the interests of labor and commerce."

There was substantial growth at the State elections of 1881, 1882 and 1883, the more encouraging because it was the consequence of steadily rising sentiment more than of passing discontent in particular States. In California, Illinois, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin the advances made were progressive steps toward further gains in subsequent years. In several States that held elections in all the three years the vote fluctuated: in Michigan it declined in 1882 and rose again in 1883; in New York it reached the maximum point in 1882; in Ohio it was highest in 1881 and lowest in 1883. But the general tendancy was upward. For the first time there were signs that the party, instead of being a mere temporary refuge for bolters, was taking permanent root, that men of influence and practical spirit were identifying themselves with it throughout the Union, and that at last the doctrine, "Prohibition with a party behind it," was to command general attention and seriously disturb political conditions. But in some States the votes cast in these years were swollen by special causes. In New York, in 1882, the unprecedented total of 25,783 (for A. A. Hopkins for Governor) came largely from unconverted Republicans, whose sole reason for acting with the Prohibitionists was dissatisfaction with the management of their party. (This was the year in which Grover Cleveland obtained his remarkable plurality of 192,000 for Governor of New York.) The sudden development of the party in California in 1882, with a strength of 5,772, is accounted for chiefly by the personal popularity of its leader, R. H. McDonald.

From 1884 *to* 1888.—The Nominating Convention of 1884 was called to meet at Pittsburgh, May 21. But it was desired by some of the new leaders, and by many who had not fully made up their minds, to make a final test of the tendencies of the other political parties before entering the field. The date was changed to July 23, and prominent representatives of the movement were sent to the Republican National Convention (at Chicago, June 5) and the Democratic National Convention (at Chicago, July 10) to appeal to those bodies to favorably recognize the temperance question as one of the political issues of the day. The Platform Committees of the two Conventions, after listening with scant courtesy to the advocates, ignored their requests. Many who had hoped that the Republican or the Democratic party would take up the cause in due time were now convinced of the hostility of both these organizations, and when the Prohibition Convention assembled at Pittsburgh on the 23d of July it was evident that a profound impression had been made on the country. Thirty-one States and Territories (including the District of Columbia) sent 465 accredited delegates, the only ones not represented being the States of Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Iowa, Mississippi, Nevada, North Carolina, South Carolina, Vermont and Virginia, and the Territories of Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Utah, Washington and Wyoming. The Convention chose as its officers William Daniel of Maryland for Temporary Chairman, Samuel Dickie of Michigan for Permanent Chairman and Mary A. Woodbridge of Ohio, Charles S. Carter of the District of Columbia, S. Cairns of Missouri, C. A. Hovey of New Hampshire and L. S. Freeman of New York for Secretaries. John P. St. John, ex-Governor of Kansas, was unanimously nominated for President and William Daniel of Maryland for Vice-President. The name of the party was once more changed, the original name of "Prohibition Party" being restored. John B. Finch of Nebraska was placed at the head of the National Committee, with A. J. Jutkins and J. A. Van Fleet (both of Illinois) as Secretaries and Samuel D. Hastings of Wisconsin as Treasurer; the temperance women were given special representation in the Committee by the selection of Miss Frances E. Willard of Illinois and Mrs. Stewart of Ohio as members-at-large. The platform follows :

"1. The Prohibition party, in National Convention assembled, acknowledge Almighty God as the rightful sovereign of all men, from whom the just powers of government are derived and to whose laws human enactments should conform as an absolute condition of peace, prosperity and happiness.

"2. That the importation, manufacture, supply and sale of alcoholic beverages, created and maintained by the laws of the National and State Governments during the entire history of such laws, are everywhere shown to be the promoting cause of intemperance, with resulting crime and pauperism, making large demands upon public and private charity; imposing large and unjust taxation for the support of penal and sheltering institutions, upon thrift, industry, manufactures and commerce; endangering the public peace; desecrating the Sabbath; corrupting our politics, legislation and administration of the laws; shortening lives, impairing health and diminishing productive industry; causing education to be neglected and despised; nullifying the teachings of the Bible, the church and the school, the standards and guides of our fathers and their children in the founding and growth of our widely-extended country; and which, imperilling the perpetuity of our civil and religious liberties, are baleful fruits by which we know that these laws are contrary to God's laws and contravene our happiness. We therefore call upon our fellow-citizens to aid in the repeal of these laws and in the legal suppression of this baneful liquor traffic.

"3. During the 24 years in which the Republican party has controlled the general Government and many of the States, no effort has been made to change this policy. Territories have been created, Governments for them established, States admitted to the Union, and in no instance in either case has this traffic been forbidden or the people been permitted to prohibit it. That there are now over 200,000 distilleries, breweries, wholesale and retail dealers in their products, holding certificates and claiming the authority of Government for the continuation of the business so destructive to the moral and material welfare of the people, together with the fact that they have turned a deaf ear to remonstrance and petition for the correction of this abuse of civil government, is conclusive that the Republican party is insensible to or impotent for the redress of these wrongs, and should no longer be entrusted with the powers and responsibilities of government. Although this party in its late National Convention was silent on the liquor question, not so its candidates, Messrs. Blaine and Logan. Within the year past Mr. Blaine has recommended that the revenue derived from the liquor traffic be distributed among the States; and Senator Logan has, by bill, proposed to devote these revenues to the support of the public schools. Thus both virtually recommend the perpetuation of the traffic, and that the States and their citizens become partners in the liquor crime.

"4. That the Democratic party has in its national deliverances of party policy arrayed itself on the side of the drink-makers and sellers by declaring against the policy of Prohibition under the false name of 'sumptuary laws;' that when in power in many of the States it has refused remedial legislation, and that in Congress it has obstructed the creation of a Commission of Inquiry into the effects of this traffic, proving that it should not be entrusted with power and place.

"5. That there can be no greater peril to the nation than the existing competition of the Republican and Democratic parties for the liquor vote. Experience shows that any party not openly opposed to the traffic will engage in this competition, will court the favor of the criminal classes, will barter the public morals, the purity of the ballot and every trust and object of good government for party success. Patriots and good citizens should, therefore, immediately withdraw from all connection with these parties.

"6. That we favor reforms in the abolition of all sinecures with useless offices and officers, and in elections by the people instead of appointments by the President; that as competency, honesty and sobriety are essential qualifications for office, we oppose removals except when absolutely necessary to secure effectiveness in vital issues; that the collection of revenues from alcoholic liquors and tobacco should be abolished, since the vices of men are not proper subjects of taxation; that revenue from customs duties should be levied for the support of the Government economically administered, and in such manner as will foster American industries and labor; that the public lands should be held for homes for the people, and not bestowed as gifts to corporations, or sold in large tracts for speculation upon the needs of actual settlers; that grateful care and support should be given to our soldiers and sailors disabled in the service of their country, and to their dependent widows and orphans; that we repudiate as un-American and contrary to and subversive of the principles of the Declaration of Independence, that any person or people should be excluded from residence or citizenship who may desire the benefits which our institutions confer upon the oppressed of all nations; that while these are important reforms, and are demanded for purity of administration and the welfare of the people, their importance sinks into insignificance when compared with the drink traffic, which now annually wastes $800,000,000 of the wealth created by toil and thrift, dragging down thousands of families from comfort to poverty, filling jails, penitentiaries, insane asylums, hospitals and institutions for dependency, impairing the health and destroying the lives of thousands, lowering intellectual vigor and dulling the cunning hand of the artisan, causing bankruptcy, insolvency and loss in trade, and by its corrupting power endangering the perpetuity of free institutions; that Congress should exercise its undoubted power by prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages in the District of Columbia, the Territories of the United States and all places over which the Government has exclusive jurisdiction; that hereafter no State should be admitted to the Union until its Constitution shall expressly and forever prohibit polygamy and the manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages, and that Congress shall submit to the States an Amendment to the Constitution forever prohibiting the importation, exportation, manufacture and sale of alcoholic drinks.

"7. We earnestly call the attention of the mechanic, the miner and manufacturer to the investigation of the baneful effects upon labor and industry of the needless liquor business. It will be found the robber who lessens wages and profits, foments discontent and strikes, and the destroyer of family welfare. Labor and all legitimate industries demand deliverance from the taxation and loss which this traffic imposes; and no tariff or other legislation can so healthily stimulate production, or increase the demand for capital and labor, or insure so much of comfort and content to the laborer, mechanic and capitalist as would the suppression of this traffic.

"8. That the activity and co-operation of the women of America for the promotion of temperance has in all the history of the past been a strength and encouragement which we gratefully acknowledge and record. In the later and present phase of the movement for the Prohibition of the traffic, the purity of purpose and method, the earnestness, zeal, intelligence and devotion of the mothers and daughters of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union have been eminently blessed of God. Kansas and Iowa have been given them as 'sheaves' of rejoicing, and the education and arousing of the public mind, and the now prevailing demand for the Constitutional Amendment, are largely the fruit of their prayers and labors. Sharing in the efforts that shall bring the question of the abolition of this traffic to the polls, they shall join in the grand 'Praise God, from whom all blessings flow,' when by law victory shall be achieved.

"9. That, believing in the civil and the political equality of the sexes, and that the ballot in the hands of woman is her right for protection and would prove a powerful ally for the abolition of the liquor traffic, the execution of the law, the promotion of reform in civil affairs, the removal of corruption in public life, we enunciate the principle and relegate the practical outworking of this reform to the discretion of the Prohibition party in the several States according to the condition of public sentiment in those States.

"10. That we gratefully acknowledge the presence of the divine spirit guiding the counsels and granting the success which has been vouchsafed in the progress of the temperance reform ; and we earnestly ask the voters of these United States to make the principles of the above declaration dominant in the Government of the nation."

With the Presidential campaign of 1884 the National Prohibition party ceased to be a merely nominal organization and began its active career. A headquarters was opened at Chicago and an energetic canvass was made. Mr. St. John and numerous other able speakers addressed large audiences in many States. Mr. Finch, as Chairman of the National Committee, developed great executive talent, shrewdness, tact, judgment and foresight. He set before himself the object of winning the largest possible vote in the States of greatest political importance, in order to give strategic position to the party. New York, as the pivotal State, received chief attention. The work was so effective that the most strenuous efforts were made to counteract it by the politicians whose interests were endangered. These efforts were eminently unscrupulous; the Republican National Committee even entered formally into a scheme to procure Mr. St. John's withdrawal by bribery.[1] After the election this undertaking was laid bare, and though the most malignant charges were made against Mr. St. John it was proved that he was above suspicion. The opposing political leaders did not venture to meet the issues for which the Prohibitionists stood. The Democrats, it is true, very frankly declared against their policy whenever representative Democratic opinion was sought, but without discussing the principles involved. The Republicans evaded the question, and the most noteworthy attempt to answer the interrogations with which they were ceaselessly plied was Mr. Blaine's deprecating assertion that Prohibition should be regarded as a State issue and should not have a place in national politics. (See p. 109.)

The party was strengthened by co-operation from certain elements of voters who conscientiously opposed both Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Blaine on grounds of personality, and who, recognizing in Mr. St. John a pure man and in his cause a movement of good aspirations, sustained the Prohibition ticket because (from their points of view) no other acceptable one was presented. Prominent among citizens of this class were Dr. Howard Crosby, Judge Noah Davis, Dr. Theodore L. Cuyler and Henry H. Faxon. The influential New York *Independent* advocated Mr. St. John's candidacy. In Massachusetts, New York and Vermont the number of "independent" allies was especially large.

Among those who had stood before the public for years as the foremost champions of temperance reform the sentiment in behalf of St. John seemed to be overwhelming. Of course there were important exceptions: men like Dr. Daniel Dorchester and women like Mrs. J. Ellen Foster were antagonistic. Even Neal Dow, who had been the candidate of the party in 1880, was known to prefer Mr. Blaine.[2] But as a class the best-known leaders of temperance opinion were so nearly united for the ticket that exceptions excited remark. On the other hand there was no such strength and concert of feeling among those prominent citizens who, while not at the front in the anti-liquor agitation, were yet sincere sympathizers with it: these individuals were generally unwilling to sacrifice their lifelong political affiliations. Most of the temperance organizations took neutral ground, leaving their members free to vote as they chose ; for these organizations existed for educational and social rather than for political purposes. But many of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions, following the example of their national organization (which had done so much to concentrate the demand for faithful political support of Prohibition) gave cordial encouragement. Highly important was the help that came from the churches. Here again there was nothing like unanimity, and there is no doubt that, counting the clergymen of all denominations, a large majority were (avowedly or unavowedly) opposed to the movement; but considering the intensity of the dislike and even hatred with which the "third" party was regarded in most communities it is remarkable that so enthusiastic and so aggressive a championship was accorded by a very large element of ministers.

---

[1] See the "Political Prohibitionist for 1888," p. 34.

[2] Mr. Dow, however, soon returned to the Prohibition party.

This memorable campaign brought fresh vigor to the Prohibition press. The first number of the *Voice* was issued Sept. 25, 1884. After the November election it was suspended until the 1st of January, 1885, and since that date its publication has been continued without interruption, under the general supervision of I. K. Funk, D.D., and, for the most of the time, the directing editorship of Mr. E. J. Wheeler. The newspaper organs of the party that were in existence previously to 1884 illustrated the difficulties and hardships against which the pioneers of the cause contended. They also displayed the zeal, the singular perseverence and tenacity and the devotion that made larger results possible. There was in those days no permanent constituency of voters from which a support sufficient to maintain an expensive periodical advocating political Prohibition could be reliably drawn; consequently most of the journals of that period were local in scope, circulation and influence. The first, unquestionably, to formally urge the creation of a distinctive Prohibition party, was the *Peninsular Herald*, published and edited by Rev. John Russell and his son, Charles P. Russell, in Detroit, Mich. It was established at Romeo, Mich., in 1864, as a temperance paper, and removed to Detroit in 1866. Early in 1867 it began to show reasons for the Prohibition party plan. In 1873 it passed into other hands. The Delaware *Signal*, also particularly deserving of mention, was started in 1873, at Delaware, O., and for many years was conducted by Thomas Evans, Jr., one of the noblest of Ohio's Prohibitionists; in 1886 it was merged with the *New Era* (Springfield, O). The *National Liberator*, another early newspaper of the party, was in 1884 consolidated with the *Lever* (which up to that time had been a Republican temperance paper, published at Grand Rapids and afterward at Detroit); the new journal, called the *Lever and National Liberator*, under the management of J. A. Van Fleet, was issued at Chicago and became one of the chief defenders of the new idea. The *National Reformer* (New York), edited by A. A. Hopkins and W. McK. Gatchell, was at the head of the Eastern newspapers committed to the programme; it was absorbed by the *Voice* soon after the campaign of 1884. The *Witness* of New York, a general religious weekly with a great circulation, won the lasting gratitude of the party Prohibitionists by espousing their principles in the St. John fight and adhering to them afterward; the popular New York *Pioneer* (George R. Scott, editor) was an outgrowth of the *Witness*. To even enumerate the noticeably intelligent and useful Prohibition journals that have sprung up since 1884 would be a difficult task, which does not come within the scope of an article treating of outlines rather than minutiæ. It is enough to say that the number of these periodicals has steadily increased, and is now probably in the neighborhood of 250, and that among them are fully a score of exceptionally strong and aggressive sheets, of national and State importance.

The following are the votes cast for the Prohibition candidates in the four years beginning with 1884:

States.	President, 1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.
Alabama	613	....	766	....
California	2,960	....	6,432	....
Colorado	761	....	3,597[1]	....
Connecticut	2,305	....	4,699	....
Delaware	64	....	7,835	....
Florida	72	....	243[1]	....
Georgia	168	....	....	....
Illinois	12,074	....	19,766	....
Indiana	3,028	....	9,185	....
Iowa	1,472	1,405	518	309
Kansas	4,495	....	8,094	....
Kentucky	3,139	39,405	....	8,390
Louisiana	328	....	....	....
Maine	2,160	....	3,873	....
Maryland	2,827	2,146	7,195	4,416
Massachusetts	9,923	4,714	8,251	10,945
Michigan	18,403	14,708	25,179	18,530
Minnesota	4,684	....	8,966	....
Missouri	2,153	....	3,504	....
Nebraska	2,899	4,445	8,175	7,359
New Hampshire	1,570	....	2,137	....
New Jersey	6,153	9,199[2]	19,808	12,600[2]
New York	24,999	30,867	36,437	41,850
North Carolina	454	....	4,107[2]	....
Ohio	11,069	28,081	28,982	29,700
Oregon	492	....	2,753[1]	....
Pennsylvania	15,283	15,047	32,458	18,471
Rhode Island	928	1,206	2,585	1,895
Tennessee	1,131	....	....	....
Texas	3,534	....	19,186	....
Vermont	1,752	....	1,541	....
Virginia	138	....	....	....
West Virginia	939	....	1,492	....
Wisconsin	7,656	....	17,089	....
Totals	150,626	151,223	294,863	154,465

[1] Aggregates on Congressmen.

[2] Aggregates on members of Legislatures.

Popular vote for President in 1884: Cleveland (Dem.), 4,874,986; Blaine (Rep.), 4,851,981; Butler (Greenb.), 175,370; St. John (Proh.), 150,626.

Thirty-four of the 38 States yielded votes in 1884, the missing States being

Arkansas, Mississippi, Nevada and South Carolina. This was the first year in the history of the party in which it had an appreciable following in the South: of the 16 States constituting the so-called "Solid South," 13 gave votes to St. John aggregating 15,560. There was a marked advance throughout the principal States of the North. New York decided the Presidential election in favor of Cleveland, but by a very small plurality (1,047); and, assuming that the accessions to the Prohibition party came chiefly from the Republicans, it is evident that the result in the country at large would have been reversed if no Prohibition ticket had been run. In other close States (Connecticut and New Jersey) the Prohibitionists also held the balance of power. In several instances the votes for State officers were significant: Missouri gave John A. Brooks (candidate for Governor) 10,426, and in Michigan David Preston, the prominent banker, received 22,207; in Massachusetts the State ticket was headed by the distinguished Julius H. Seelye, President of Amherst College, but his vote was only 8,581, considerably less than St. John's, proving that the Presidential candidate was supported in Massachusetts by many citizens who did not accept the creed of the party.

The defeat of Blaine caused an outburst of Republican wrath against the Prohibitionists, akin to the violent abuse that was heaped on the Abolitionists 40 years before, when their action in the State of New York deprived Henry Clay of the Presidency. A few days after the election the New York *Tribune* printed an editorial entitled "Intemperate Temperance Men," arraigning the partisans of St. John. Bitter persecutions followed. The Prohibition leader was burned or hanged in effigy throughout the country, ministers who had supported him were dismissed from their pulpits, business men were boycotted and saloons were brought back to Local Option towns. These manifestations of intolerance became less frequent as time passed, but in all the succeeding years the Prohibitionists suffered from incendiary and scurrilous attacks. The temper of a large element of Republicans was characteristically expressed by Mr. Murat Halstead in the Cincinnati *Commercial Gazette*, July 4, 1887: "The Republicans have made a mistake in not fighting the St. John frauds with fire and brimstone, clubs, pitchforks and butcher-knives."

Preparations were speedily made for continuing the agitation. A National Conference was held in New York, Jan. 7 and 8, 1885. It was decided to make special efforts to develop the party at the South, in promotion of one of its cardinal ideas, that a non-sectional political organization was one of the imperative needs of the day. Accordingly several of the best speakers (notably A. A. Hopkins and Rev. C. H. Mead) were placed in the Southern States and sent there to renew the work in subsequent years. Attention was given to the strengthening of both the National and State Committees of the party. Special organizations were created, the most important being the National Prohibition Bureau (organized in November, 1885, with Gen. Clinton B. Fisk as President and W. McK. Gatchell as Secretary), the National Inter-Collegiate Prohibition Association (organized by Mr. Walter Thomas Mills but abandoned after some months), the Junior Prohibition Clubs and the National Young Men's Prohibition Association. The Bureau undertook to make engagements for speakers and performed valuable service, but since its work legitimately belonged to the National Committee it was discontinued in 1889. The death of John B. Finch in October, 1887, was a heavy blow to the party. His place as Chairman was filled in November of the same year by the selection of Samuel Dickie of Michigan.

Throughout the four years following the St. John campaign there was an increasing realization of the value of solidification and discipline. Every exertion was made to strengthen the national organization, and the improvement of the party's position and prospects in the States was sought not for State purposes but for the advancement of the national cause. Great generosity was exhibited by individual Prohibitionists, and while funds were never overabundant the financial resources at the disposal of the managers became ampler with each year.

The vote polled in 1885 was cheering. In 11 States a strength was shown that exceeded St. John's in the entire Union. But a large part of the Kentucky vote of nearly 40,000 did not belong properly to the Prohibition party: the Republicans made no nominations in 1887, and a great many of them supported the Prohibition candidate (Judge Fontaine T. Fox) rather than accept the Democratic ticket or abstain. It is probable that the normal "straight" Prohibition vote of Kentucky in this year did not exceed 5,000, and if this is true the aggregate in the 11 States was not above 116,000. Very encouraging was the advance in Ohio from 11,069 to 28,081, gained by the aggressive canvass of A. B. Leonard, D.D., the candidate for Governor.

In 1886 there were general elections, and the party was represented in the returns from 29 States (Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Nevada, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia being the nine States where no Prohibition candidates were run, the failure to nominate being caused in most cases by the fact that no State officers, but only Members of Congress, were to be chosen). The balance of power was held in 14 States, as follows: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, West Virginia and Wisconsin. In the South the total was increased to 44,328. Congressional candidates were in the field in 209 districts. The marked progress in Michigan, New Jersey and Pennsylvania was due to the leadership of Samuel Dickie, Clinton B. Fisk and Charles S. Wolfe.

In 1887, with 11 States contributing to the support of the party, the record of 1885 was surpassed. The most interesting results were in New York, which repeated the gain that had been made each year since 1883, and in Ohio, which again increased the Leonard vote.

From 1888 *to* 1891.—After the election of 1884 it was a common remark among the advocates of the Prohibition party that they had "elected their issue" to a conspicuous place in national politics. Their hope was that it would soon be made the dividing issue, and that a reconstruction of parties would be accomplished. Many believed that the expected result would come to pass at the Presidential contest of 1888. But the rising interest in the tariff discussion interfered with their plans. The aggressive low tariff message sent by President Cleveland to Congress in December, 1887, plainly showed that the coming battle would be fought on the lines there drawn. From the fervor with which the President's attitude was defended and the vigor with which it was attacked it might have been foreseen that the consideration of other questions would be postponed until the tariff controversy should be definitely adjusted. Results demonstrated that the confident Prohibitionists undervalued the influence of the tariff issue. It administered a check to their movement whose effects, while not immediately apparent, were recognized after the election of 1888.

The party held its National Convention at Indianapolis on the 30th and 31st of May. Forty-two States and Territories, and the District of Columbia, sent regularly-chosen delegates, numbering 1,029; the States of Mississippi and South Carolina, and the Territory of Wyoming, were not represented. The Temporary Chairman was Rev. H. A. Delano of Connecticut; Permanent Chairman, John P. St. John of Kansas; Secretaries, Sam W. Small of Georgia, J. B. Cranfill of Texas, Mrs. Mattie McClellan Brown of Ohio and G. F. Wells of Minnesota. By voluntary subscriptions a campaign fund in excess of $25,000 was raised. Samuel Dickie was continued as Chairman and Samuel D. Hastings as Treasurer of the National Committee, and J. B. Hobbs of Illinois was made Secretary. The nominations for President and Vice-President were given, respectively, to Gen. Clinton B. Fisk of New Jersey and John A. Brooks of Missouri. The following is the platform:

"The Prohibition party, in National Convention assembled, acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all power in government, do hereby declare:

"1. That the manufacture, importation, exportation, transportation and sale of alcoholic beverages should be made public crimes, and prohibited as such.

"2. That such Prohibition must be secured through Amendments to our National and State Constitutions, enforced by adequate laws adequately supported by administrative authority; and to this end the organization of the Prohibition party is imperatively demanded in State and Nation.

"3. That any form of license, taxation or regulation of the liquor traffic is contrary to good government; that any party which supports regulation, license or taxation enters into alliance with such traffic and becomes the actual foe of the State's welfare, and that we arraign the Republican and Democratic parties for their persistent attitude in favor of the license iniquity, whereby they oppose the demand of the people for Prohibition, and, through open complicity with the liquor crime, defeat the enforcement of law.

"4. For the immediate abolition of the Internal Revenue system, whereby our National Government is deriving support from our greatest national vice.

"5. That an adequate public revenue being necessary, it may properly be raised by import duties; but import duties should be so reduced that no surplus shall be accumulated in the Treasury, and that the burdens of taxation shall be removed from foods, clothing and other comforts and necessaries of life, and imposed on such articles of import as will give protection both to the manufacturing employer and producing laborer against the competition of the world.

"6. That the right of suffrage rests on no mere circumstance of race, color, sex or nationality, and that where, from any cause, it has been withheld from citizens who are of suitable age, and mentally and morally qualified for the exercise of an intelligent ballot, it should be restored by the people through the Legislatures of the several States, on such educational basis as they may deem wise.[1]

"7. That civil service appointments for all civil offices, chiefly clerical in their duties, should be based upon moral, intellectual and physical qualifications, and not upon party service or party necessity.

"8. For the abolition of polygamy and the establishment of uniform laws governing marriage and divorce.

"9. For prohibiting all combinations of capital to control and to increase the cost of products for popular consumption.

"10. For the preservation and defense of the Sabbath as a civil institution, without oppressing any who religiously observe the same on any other than the first day of the week.

"11. That arbitration is the Christian, wise and economical method of settling national differences, and the same method should, by judicious legislation, be applied to the settlement of disputes between large bodies of employes and their employers; that the abolition of the saloon would remove the burdens moral, physical, pecuniary and social, which now oppress labor and rob it of its earnings, and would prove to be a wise and successful way of promoting labor reform, and we invite labor and capital to unite with us for the accomplishment thereof; that monopoly in land is a wrong to the people, and the public lands should be reserved to actual settlers; and that men and women should receive equal wages for equal work.

"12. That our immigration laws should be so enforced as to prevent the introduction into our country of all convicts, inmates of other dependent institutions, and others physically incapacitated for self-support, and that no person should have the ballot in any State who is not a citizen of the United States.

"13. Recognizing and declaring that Prohibition of the liquor traffic has become the dominant issue in national politics, we invite to full party fellowship all those who, on this one dominant issue, are with us agreed, in the full belief that this party can and will remove sectional differences, promote national unity, and insure the best welfare of our entire land."

Additional Resolutions.

"RESOLVED, That we hold that men are born free and equal, and should be made secure in all their civil, legal and political rights.

"RESOLVED, That we condemn the Democratic and Republican parties for persistently denying the right of self-government to the 600,000 people of Dakota."

Great energy and zeal characterized the Fisk and Brooks campaign. The National Committee had its headquarters in New York, and all the chief States were systematically canvassed. The expenses of the Committee (as shown by an itemized statement) aggregated $33,397.96.[2] The *Voice* raised from its readers funds that enabled the publishers to send that paper to the 60,000 clergymen of the country and (for several weeks) to 500,000 farmers. The attacks upon the party were more artfully managed than in any previous contest. The Anti-Saloon Republicans, who had made organized efforts since 1886 to win back the Prohibition vote to the Republican party, operated a campaign bureau, and a "Woman's Republican League," headed by Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, made special attempts to counteract the political influence of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. In New York the Republican candidate for Governor conducted an active campaign on the High License issue and appealed with remarkable urgency for temperance support, the object being (as he admitted afterward) to save the national ticket of his party by breaking the ranks of the Prohibitionists. The Boutelle resolution of the National Republican platform (see Republican Party) was accepted by many temperance people as justifying continued action with the Republicans. The weapons of persecution and slander were also freely used: numerous Prohibition meetings were dispersed and other outrages were committed. It was persistently charged, as usual, that the Prohibition party was in alliance with the Democrats and was sustained by Democratic money. The New York *Tribune*, after giving utterance to this charge, was challenged by Chairman Dickie to substantiate it, and although Mr. Dickie offered to pay $5,000 upon the presentation of proof that would be satisfactory to fair-minded Republicans, the *Tribune* submitted no proof and did not even notice the challenge.[1]

---

[1] There was a protracted controversy over this declaration, both in the Committee on Resolutions and in the Convention. Woman Suffrage had long been a disturbing question in the party. From the first the principle of Woman Suffrage had been indorsed in the platforms, and emphasis had been given to former utterances after the reorganization of 1882 and the alliance with the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. It was generally felt that the party owed much of its growth to the assistance coming from this important body of women, and there was a disposition to grant all that was desired by its leaders. This sympathetic tendency was strengthened by a belief, entertained by a very large element of Prohibitionists, that the demand for the ballot for women had a righteous basis, and that the Prohibition cause would be much stronger at the polls if the women were permitted to vote. But the party contained a factor of anti-Woman Suffragists and a larger factor opposed on grounds of expediency to championship of the movement. These factors had able leaders.

In the Committee on Resolutions Miss Frances E. Willard, President of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, insisted on a renewal of the Woman Suffrage plank of 1884 and an additional declaration in behalf of a Woman Suffrage Amendment to the Federal Constitution. The opposition contended for strict neutrality. After long discussion the resolution given above was framed as a compromise, and a paragraph was added at the end of the platform to soothe the anti-Suffragists. But John M. Olin of Wisconsin brought in a minority resolution, as follows:

"We believe that the right of equal suffrage to woman is one that should be settled by the several States according to the public sentiment in those States; and we promise as a party that as rapidly as we come into power we will submit this question to a vote of the people in the several States to be settled by them at the ballot-box."

The decision was then left with the Convention, which, after a fervid and brilliant debate (for which see the *Voice*, June 7, 1888), rejected the Olin resolution. Twenty-eight votes were counted in support of it.

[2] Political Prohibitionist for 1889, p. 24.

In every State but South Carolina there were ballots for Fisk and Brooks. While the total was less than at the State elections of 1886 the effort to diminish the importance of the party had utterly failed. The shrinkage in New York has already been explained; the loss of 12,000 in New Jersey and nearly as many in Pennsylvania was accounted for by the unsteadiness of the temporary converts of 1886 and the strong feeling on the tariff question. But the comparative firmness of the party in States like Ohio, Massachusetts, Michigan and Connecticut, notwithstanding the fierce and insidious assaults, and the gains in Indiana, Nebraska, Illinois and especially Minnesota, raised hopes for the future. To the Presidential vote of 1888 should be added local votes in Territories—1,336 in Dakota, 148 in Montana and 1,137 in Washington,—bringing the total up to 252,566. The Congressional vote (29 States) was 242,977, and the vote for State candidates (22 States) was 218,044.

Votes of 1888, 1889 and 1890:

States.	President, 1888.	1889.[1]	1890.[2]
Alabama	583	....	1,380
Arkansas	614	....	....
California	5,761	....	10,073
Colorado	2,191	2,218	1,089
Connecticut	4,234	....	3,413
Delaware	400	....	250
Florida	417	....	....
Georgia	1,808	....	....
Illinois	21,695	....	22,306
Indiana	9,881	....	12,106
Iowa	3,550	1,353	1,646
Kansas	6,779	....	1,230
Kentucky	5,225	3,351	4,340
Louisiana	160	....	....
Maine	2,691	....	2,981
Maryland	4,767	3,741	3,927
Massachusetts	8,701	15,108	13,554
Michigan	20,942	16,380	28,651
Minnesota	15,316	....	8,424
Mississippi	218	....	....
Missouri	4,539	....	988
Montana	....	....	389
Nebraska	9,429	5,821	3,676
Nevada	41	....	....
New Hampshire	1,594	....	1,375
New Jersey	7,939	6,853	8,425
New York	30,231	26,763	33,621
North Carolina	2,787	....	....
Ohio	24,356	26,504	23,837
Oregon	1,677	....	2,856
Pennsylvania	20,947	22,401	16,108
Rhode Island	1,251	1,346	1,820
Tennessee	5,969	....	11,082
Texas	4,749	....	1,986
Vermont	1,460	....	1,161
Virginia	1,682	....	2,126
Washington	....	....	2,819
West Virginia	1,084	....	898
Wisconsin	14,277	....	11,246
Totals	249,945	131,839	239,783

[1] Compiled from the *World* and *Tribune* Almanacs.
[2] Compiled by the Editor of the *Voice*.

Popular vote for President in 1888: Cleveland (Dem.), 5,536,242; Harrison (Rep.), 5,440,708; Fisk (Proh.), 249,945; Streeter (Union Labor), 146,836; Cowdrey (United Labor), 3,073; Curtis (American), 1,591; all others, 9,845.

In the unimportant contests of 1889 gains in some States were offset by losses in others: the most satisfactory results were the advances in Massachusetts, Ohio and Pennsylvania, and the most discouraging one was a further decline in New York. In 1890 the overwhelming defeat of the Republicans, attributed chiefly to their [McKinley] tariff legislation, indicated anew that the opportunity to divide the country for and against Prohibition would be deferred until the tariff issue should be settled. But the party retained its respectable strength in all sections of the country, and the growth in such States as Indiana, Tennessee, Michigan, New York and New Jersey was proof of unwavering constancy.

---

[1] Ibid, p. 29.

The national organization has been steadily at work since 1888. Mr. Dickie has remained at its head. Mr. Hobbs was succeeded as Secretary by John Lloyd Thomas. The lines of principle and policy as laid down in 1888 have not been changed. A National Conference was held in Louisville, Feb. 13 and 14, 1889, at which new plans and methods were discussed and the partisans and opponents of the Woman Suffrage plank exchanged opinions, but no departure was taken.

RESULTS.

Since the Prohibition party has not risen to power in any State and has never secured a foothold in Congress it has acted on public policy only in an indirect manner. No original legislation has been passed by it, and its representatives have not been charged with administrative responsibility.

There is much controversy as to the general tendency of the influence that it has exercised. With great heat the enemies of the party declare that it is "powerless for good but powerful for evil," that it spreads and perpetuates dissensions among the friends of temperance, alienates or discourages political leaders who are favorably inclined, belittles the Prohibition cause in the public estimation by its failure to control more than a handful of votes, defeats sympathizers and elects friends in many close constituencies, etc. All these criticisms seem to have an element of justice—provided separate instances are examined without regard for general bearings. But such conclusions are not so readily suggested when a broad view is taken.

Let us look first at the Prohibition States—those that have had Prohibitory laws for part or all of the time since the party was founded.

In *Massachusetts* the miserable consequences of the license act of 1868 developed so vigorous a demand for its repeal (see p. 528) that the Prohibition statute was re-enacted in 1869. Yet the new measure (as amended in 1870) was fatally defective, for it excepted malt liquors. The temperance leaders, with men like Wendell Phillips and Judge Pitman at their head, instantly organized a Prohibition party which polled large votes at the State elections of 1870 and 1871: in 1873 the Legislature eliminated the beer-exemption provision. Moreover, the improved law was enforced with signal success. (See pp. 528–9.) The new party then disappeared, and no candidates were presented in its name in 1872, 1873 and 1874. Therefore the destruction of the measure in 1875 could not have been occasioned in any degree by "third party" interference.

In *Connecticut* the Prohibitory law was removed from the statutes before the Prohibition party had an existence in that State.

In *Rhode Island* the enactment of the law of 1874 was brought about by powerful public sentiment. There was no Prohibition party to "divide the friends of the cause," yet the act went under in a single year. The Republican Prohibitionists made a factional endeavor to save it and afterward to restore it, bolting their party repeatedly and thus setting an instructive precedent. The Constitutional Amendment of 1886, like the law of 1874, was enacted in obedience to the earnest desire of the people. In the momentous political struggles of 1887, 1888 and 1889 the Prohibition party was never an important factor, for its vote was always less than 2,000. It could not have been responsible for the repeal of 1889. It is more probable that the insignificance of the distinctive Prohibition vote quieted all misgivings that the political conspirators might have had and emboldened them to fulfill the desires of the liquor element.

In *Michigan* the Prohibitory law was so weak that its repeal (1875) was hardly a loss to the cause. It is a coincidence that the Prohibition party was also weak. Its operations did not give the politicians concern, and the fact that they repealed the measure instead of strengthening it cannot be explained by blaming the "third" party.

In *Maine* there was no independent Prohibition vote of any consequence until 1884; in 1886 this vote was increased. In 1887 the most important amendments (providing for prima facie evidence and raising penalties) that had been added to the Maine law in many years were enacted. The campaigns of the Prohibition party have been energetically conducted in Maine, chiefly on the issue of the enforcement of the law and for the cultivation of national Prohibition sentiment, but there are no signs that the agitation has injured the support of the law. On the other hand there has been a positive improvement. The party, however, has no considerable influence in Maine, and Republican supremacy is not threatened by it. This may or may not help to account for the violations permitted in certain cities—violations that bring the policy into discredit and greatly weaken the influence which Maine's example should have for the general advancement of Prohibition.

In *Vermont* also the Prohibition party is feeble. The law, too, is relatively feeble (at least so far as penalties are concerned), and its enemies are aggressive and hopeful.

In *New Hampshire* for years the statute has been less satisfactory than that of any other Prohibition State. Beer was formerly exempted and the manufacture is still permitted. The dominant party, being able to retain the temperance vote without perfecting the measure, has performed little work of value. For ten years up to 1884 the Prohibition party scarcely had an existence in New Hampshire. The most useful enforcement amendment (providing for injunction) was added in 1887, the year after the Prohibition vote reached its highest point.

In *Kansas* the Constitutional Amendment was unexpectedly adopted, and for five years the statute built upon it was not satisfactorily executed. During nearly the whole of that period there was no Prohibition party in the State. The growth of the organization was not attended by disasters but by a uniformly increasing stringency of enforcement. It is not claimed that the success of the law since 1884 is to be credited to the activity of the Prohibition party, but (to say the least) the work of the party has not been detrimental to the cause in Kansas.

In the case of *Iowa* it is demonstrable that the submission of the Constitutional Amendment, which led to its adoption and to the passage of the present statute, was a direct result of the large vote given the Prohibition ticket in 1877. (See p. 105.) After the Amendment had been annulled by the Supreme Court a disposition to ignore the will of the people was manifested by the partisan managers, but at an imposing assemblage of the Prohibitionists of the State it was deliberately declared that a political revolt would follow if the desired legislation were not granted, and this put an end to all plots. There is no doubt that the fear of a Prohibition rising operated to deter the Republican leaders from making concessions to the liquor-sellers at the legislative session of 1889.

In *South Dakota* the work which led up to the successful Amendment campaign of 1889 was inaugurated with the formation of the Prohibition party and the canvass made under the auspices of that party in the winter of 1888–9. The certainty that a formidable Prohibition party would take the field unless the Republicans should espouse the movement was the chief cause of the acceptance of the issue by the Republican State Convention. (See p. 126.)

In the license and Local Option States we find that, as a rule, the most notable concessions (or attempted concessions) to temperance demands have been made where the Prohibition party has reached important development. The "third" party vote of more than 16,000 in Massachusetts in 1877 was responded to, soon afterward, by the enactment of the most comprehensive Local Option act of the Union. Contrast this act with the weaker one of Connecticut, a State in which the Prohibitionists were slow to resort to independent tactics. In Georgia, where nearly all the counties are under Prohibition in consequence of local majorities, there has been no Prohibition party, and no progress has been made beyond Local Option. Similar comments may be made on the situation in several other Southern States. The most important era of liquor legislation since the Civil War is that beginning with 1884, the year in which the national vote of the Prohibitionists first assumed considerable proportions.[1] It is true most of this legislation is of a compromise nature and of little real value, but it reflects a growth of interest that is remarkable.

---

[1] See the "Political Prohibitionist for 1888," p. 61.

Far from dividing the temperance forces or reducing their organized strength, the growth of the Prohibition party has been accompanied by a great increase in the membership of all temperance societies, a deepening of conviction and a harmonizing of purpose.

Yet it is said that friendly individuals associated with other parties, men of high character and sincere devotion to the temperance reform—sometimes men who would do much of practical value for the Prohibition movement if chosen to official position, are made to suffer by the indiscriminate warfare which the Prohibition party wages, while the votes drawn off from these deserving candidates decide elections in favor of disreputable men, subservient tools of the saloon. Thus (it is asserted) the chance of accomplishing positive good, even though local and temporary good, is thrown away for the sake of upholding a faction that cannot possibly achieve success. But most of these complaints are based on assumptions that experience does not justify: individual "good men" who accept nominations from license parties are nearly always under restraints that destroy their capabilities and neutralize their intentions. In view of the bitter disappointments that have so frequently attended fusions and indorsements, and the probability that an advantage gained by such methods will be of brief duration, it is felt by the Prohibitionists to be more important to maintain their organization and their high standard than to enter into shifting or experimental alliances against the solid forces of the rum power. Besides, the discipline of defeat is not necessarily unwholesome in its influence upon halting friends. And if the general effect of separate party action is to promote the larger interests of the cause (as the advocates of the party fully believe), there are strong reasons for uniformity of action.

In the Northern States the accessions to the party come principally from the Republicans, in the Southern States from the Democrats. Conditions have prevented general development in the South: the intense earnestness with which a large majority of the whites in that section insist upon maintaining the Democratic party, under existing social and political conditions, operates against a wide acceptance of the propaganda there. To obtain some indication of the relative representation of former Republicans and former Democrats in the party, the *Voice*, in 1888, solicited correspondence from its readers. Cards were received from 2,429 voting members of the Prohibition party, of whom 1,856 were former Republicans, 468 were former Democrats, 50 were former Greenbackers, 19 had been Independents and 36 had never voted any other ticket than the Prohibition. Less than 200 replies were from the South.[1]

Protestant Episcopal Church.—No official action touching the temperance question is taken by this denomination. But the Church Temperance Society (see p. 81) has the approval of the Bishops. At the General Convention of the House of Bishops in Philadelphia in 1883, the following declaration was submitted and signed:

> "*Inasmuch as* intemperance is an evil of such magnitude as to call for special effort for its suppression, in the interests of social order, of morality and of religion; and
>
> "*Inasmuch as* the Society known as the Church Temperance Society recognizes the grace of God as the only sufficient remedy for such an evil, the church of God as the only sufficient instrument for its suppression, and the word of God as the only sufficient guide in the prosecution of temperance reform; and
>
> "*Inasmuch as* the said Society rests upon the Scriptural principle that temperance is the law of the gospel and total abstinence a rule of expediency, a measure of necessity or an act of self-abnegation in certain cases, thus avoiding any breach of the great law of Christian liberty; and
>
> "*Inasmuch as* the said Society during the past two years and a half has borne faithful witness to these important principles and has labored zealously in the pursuit of its great aims,
>
> "We, Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, hereby express our cordial sympathy with the Church Temperance Society and commend its work to the attentive consideration of the whole church."

In 1890 60 of the 63 Bishops were among the Vice-Presidents of the Church Temperance Society.

Public Sentiment.—Among the Mohammedan nations, where the voice of instinct is supported by religious precepts and legal statutes, public opinion is almost unanimous in recognizing the evils of the alcohol vice and the necessity for the suppression of the liquor traffic. True science has never failed to second the protests of nature, and among the twelve principal nations of Christendom the opposition to the outrage of the poison traffic may be said to be strictly proportioned to the degree of general intelligence. Still it is well to recognize the full extent of the adverse bias, and the prejudice against the enactment of Prohibitory laws may be traced to the influence of the following principal agencies:

---

[1] The *Voice*, July 12, 1888.

1. *Government Abettors.*—In several countries of continental Europe the traffic in alcoholic liquors is directly encouraged by Governments deriving a large percentage of their revenues from the sale of intoxicating beverages and thus, as it were, coining gain from the misery of their taxpaying subjects. In Russia, as the traveller Kohl informs us, villagers refusing to join the topers of the public tavern are liable to be "denounced as bad patriots, because the Government of our father, the Czar, gets its main income from the sale of vodka."

2. *Literary Influences.*—By means of pamphlets, circulars, partisan journals and numberless advertisements the representatives of the liquor traffic manage to influence public opinion at an expense which demonstrates their dread of the hostile sentiment gaining force from year to year. In the United States alone the annual expenditure for direct and indirect advertisements of that sort has been estimated to exceed $50,000,000.

3. *Political Intrigues.*—The political influence of the rumsellers' party has rarely failed to secure them the connivance of a class of politicians who, as a Southern temperance orator forcibly expresses it, "would at any time sign a private agreement with the Prince of Darkness to import voters from hell at so much per legion, unless the debt could be cancelled by a reciprocation of political services."

4. *Hereditary Passions.*—The morbid appetency created by the habitual abuse of alcoholic beverages is, to a large degree, hereditary, and there are families who have transmitted a passion for special poisons to many successive generations of their descendants. It would be exaggeration to say that any human being was ever born with an unconquerable penchant for alcoholic excesses, but the inherited bias will always assert its influence in making its subject apt to yield to slight temptations and rather disinclined to entirely renounce the use of noxious stimulants even in deference to the most urgent appeals.

But the steady increase of general intelligence, aided by the revival of health-worship and the progress of social science and rational hygiene, guarantee the ultimate victory of the temperance movement. "If anyone," says Goldwin Smith, "doubts the general preponderance of good over evil in human nature, he has only to study the history of moral crusades. The enthusiastic energy and self-devotion with which a great moral cause inspires its soldiers have always prevailed, and always will prevail, over any amount of self-interest and material power arrayed on the other side."

FELIX L. OSWALD.

Rechabites are supposed to have been originally not Israelites but Kenites, who became identified with the Jews. They were descended from Jonadab, the son of Rechab, and constituted a kind of hereditary clan and religious order, noted for its piety and the abstinence that its members practiced. They wholly abjured wine and other luxuries, lived in tents, planted no vineyards and would not even cultivate grain. Their tenets are thus stated by the prophet Jeremiah (Jer. 35:6–7): "But they said, we will drink no wine: for Jonadab the son of Rechab our father commanded us, saying, Ye shall drink no wine, neither ye nor your sons for ever: neither shall ye build house nor sow seed nor plant vineyard, nor have any: but all your days ye shall dwell in tents; that ye may live many days in the land where ye are strangers." For their faithfulness to the commands of their father Jonadab—who had assisted Jehu in overthrowing Baal-worship (2 Kings 10:15–17)—they were promised by Jeremiah (Jer. 35 : 19): "Therefore thus saith the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel: Jonadab the son of Rechab shall not want a man to stand before me for ever," which promise was fulfilled by their admission to the tribe of Levi.

Rechabites, Independent Order of.—The name includes two distinct Orders, having totally different laws, rituals, etc., but recently united under a "bond of union," by which members of either Order are allowed to visit the other. The older and larger, known as the Salford Unity, was founded at Salford, Lancashire, Eng., in August, 1835, being the oldest of the modern secret temperance societies. It is an incorporated total abstinence beneficial society, paying weekly sick benefits in sums proportionate to the dues contributed by the different members, and funeral benefits determined in like manner. The present membership of this branch, comprising three divisions—for men, women and children—is about 150,000, and it is rapidly increasing. The governing powers are vested in District Tents, meeting annually and semi-annually, and in a High Tent or High Moveable Conference, meeting biennially, composed of representatives from the District Tents. Those interested are referred to Henry Wardropper, H.C.R., No. 12 Azalea Terrace, South Sunderland, Eng., for further information.

"The Independent Order of Rechabites in North America" has nothing in common with the other Order except the name, the titles of some of the officers and the pledge. This Order was founded in New York City, Aug. 2, 1842, and therefore it is one year older than the Sons of Temperance, and the oldest secret total abstinence organization in America. At first it grew rapidly, its Tents numbering above 1,000; but in 1856 it began to decline and since the Civil War it has never recovered its former strength, its place being now largely taken by the Independent Order of Good Templars and the Sons of Temperance.

The objects, as given in the constitution, are "Mutual benefit in the exercise of temperance, fortitude and justice; securing to its membership sympathy and relief in times of sickness and distress, and in the event of death the decent observance of necessary funeral obsequies; and it is based upon and seeks the extension of the principles of total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks." The membership is in three classes: Primary Tents, composed of "white males of good moral character, not under 16 years of age, believing in the existence and omnipotence of God, and willing to sign our pledge;" Woman's Tents, composed of "white women and girls of good moral character and not less than 12 years of age," with any member in good standing in a male Primary Tent who may be admitted by ballot, and Junior Tents, composed of "white youths of good moral character, who believe in a Supreme Being and are willing to sign our pledge of total abstinence, who are between the ages of 10 and 18 years." The pledge is as follows:

> "I hereby declare that I will abstain from all intoxicating liquors, including wine, beer and cider; and I will not give or offer them to others, except in religious ordinances, or when prescribed in good faith by a medical practitioner; I will not engage in the traffic of them, and in all suitable ways will discountenance the use, manufacture and sale of them; and to the utmost of my power I will endeavor to spread the principles of total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors."

All power is vested in Grand Tents, having control of the different States, and a High Tent, with supreme control. The High Tent meets annually, and is composed of one representative from each Primary, Woman's, Junior and Grand Tent in good standing, and Past High Representatives who continue in good standing.

Since the war factional strife has prevented satisfactory growth, the present membership numbering scarcely a hundred Tents, with a few thousand members, scattered over Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Ohio, Kansas, West Virginia, Illinois, Michigan and the District of Columbia. In August, 1888, a large faction that had broken away from the original Order, under an organization and incorporation of its own, was induced to give up its incorporation and return. At present the Rechabites are slowly increasing in this country, and under good management may in time regain their old footing.

Frank D. Russell.

Rectification is repeated distillation, conducted for the purpose of refining and concentrating alcoholic spirits. Strong and pure alcohol cannot be produced by a single act of distillation, for a large percentage of water, with very noxious impurities (such as fusel oil and the higher alcohols), are generated. To eliminate these redistillation, carefully managed, is essential. Beverage liquors (whiskey, rum, etc.) are not rectified, because rectification destroys the characteristic flavors and other qualities of special varieties of liquor, yielding only clear alcohol, which has an unattractive taste. These beverages (if honestly obtained) are purified by being retained in the warehouse two or three years; for with the lapse of time chemical changes occur in the liquor, destroying the fusel oil, etc. But the largest part of the spirits used for drinking purposes is not systematically aged. This is notorious. And a very considerable quantity of it is not carefully rectified. This is equally notorious. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, there were 91,133,550 gallons of tax-paid spirits produced in the United States. In the same year only 61,013,966 gallons were classed as "rectified," while the quantity reserved by distillers for conversion into genuine aged liquors was probably not above 15,000,000 gallons.[1]

It is of course impossible to determine how large a percentage of the 61,013,966 gallons classed as "rectified" in the Internal Revenue report was only partially or nominally rectified. But there are the best of reasons for declaring that (aside from the portion intended for medicinal uses, etc.) very little of it underwent rectification at all. Candid experts admit the truth of this statement, confessing that almost the entire amount of beverage spirits is the product of but a single distillation, or at the most of two distillations—the second one being conducted more for reducing the percentage of water than for getting rid of the impurities.

Besides, it is well known that most of the "rectifiers'" permits issued by the United States officers are procured by wholesale liquor-dealers and others whose especial business is to mix, compound, blend and "cut" liquors. The Internal Revenue laws define a "rectifier," first, as one who "rectifies, purifies or refines distilled spirits or wines *by any process other than by original and continuous distillation* from mash, wort or wash, through continuous closed vessels and pipes," or second, as a "wholesale or retail liquor-dealer who has in his possession any still or leach-tub, or who keeps any other apparatus for the purpose of refining in any manner distilled spirits," or third, any "person who, *without rectifying, purifying or refining distilled spirits, shall, by mixing such spirits, wine or other liquor with any materials,* manufacture any spurious, imitation or compound liquors for sale, under the name of whiskey, brandy, gin, rum, wine, spirits, cordials or wine-bitters, or any other name."[2] The annual United States tax on rectifiers is $200 if the product is as much as 500 barrels (reckoning 40 gallons to the barrel), or $100 if less than 500 barrels. If the distillers were solicitous for the purity of their stuff they would naturally combine rectifying with their business; but they do not. In the fiscal year 1888–9, while 4,349 distilleries were operated only 1,368 persons paid the rectifier's special tax. And most of these 1,368 were not rectifiers at all, but mere compounders, who took the corrupt product of the distilleries, and, without redistilling it, mixed it with other liquors, neutralized the objectionable taste with chemicals and sold the doctored article to the dealers.

[See also DISTILLATION and SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS.]

Reformed Drinkers.—Among temperance people in general there is a tendency to overrate the difficulty of total abstinence, but it is equally certain that the difficulty of complete reform is apt to be considerably underrated. A reformed toper has lost the advantages of the unseduced child whose disposition to heed the warnings of its parents and preceptors is supported by the voice of instinct—the intuitive aversion to the first taste of the intoxicating poison. After that instinct has been once perverted the morbid craving for strong drink may be overcome by years of resolute abstinence, but the abnormal diathesis remains in a latent form, and is apt to awaken at the slightest encouragement. "What takes place in the stomach of a reformed drunkard," says Dr. Sewall, "of the individual who abandons the use of all intoxicating drink? The stomach, by that extraordinary self-restorative power of nature, gradually resumes its natural appearance. Its engorged blood-vessels become reduced to their original size, and a few weeks or months will accomplish this renovation, after which the individual has no longer any suffering or desire for alcohol. It is nevertheless true, and should ever be borne in mind, that such is the sensibility of the stomach of the reformed drunkard that a repetition of the use of alcohol *in the slightest degree, and in any form, under any circumstance,* revives the appetite. The blood-vessels again become dilated and the morbid sensibility of the organ is reproduced."

---

[1] This estimate of the quantity so reserved is based on the statement of John M. Atherton, before a Congressional Committee in 1888, that the average annual product of honest Kentucky whiskey would not exceed 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 gallons, and that the amount of liquor aged in other States than Kentucky was small.

[2] Internal Revenue Laws (1889), Section 3244.

"People sometimes wonder," says Dr. Isaac Jennings, "why such and such men, possessing great intellectual power and firmness of character in other respects, cannot drink moderately, and not give themselves up to drunkenness. They become drunkards by law—fixed, immutable law. Let a man with a constitution as perfect as Adam's undertake to drink alcohol, moderately and perseveringly, with all the caution and deliberate determination he can command, and if he could live long enough he would just as certainly become a drunkard—get to a point where he could not refrain from drinking to excess—as he would go over Niagara Falls when placed in a canoe in the river above the falls and left to the natural operation of the current. And proportionately as he descended the stream would his alcoholic attraction for it increase, so that he would find it more and more difficult to get ashore, until he reached a point where escape was impossible. And if this man, after having commenced his progress down the river of intemperance, were to go ashore at any time, or from any point in the river, and remain on shore a longer or shorter period and then take to his canoe again, he would start afresh for the falls at the very point from which he left. For even when the inebriate abandons all use of alcoholic drinks and the economy of life immediately puts in operation a train of action that generally results in an apparent renovation of the system, a deep, latent and serious evil of some kind nevertheless remains."

Hence the fallacy of the compromisers who recommend the milder alcoholics as antidotes for the brandy vice. For a time the surrogate may bring a delusive relief, but it cannot satisfy the thirst for the stronger tonic and only serves to perpetuate the stimulant-diathesis—the poison-hunger, which will sooner or later revert to the wonted object of its passion. Unswerving loyalty to the pledge of total abstinence is not at first the easiest, but is eventually the surest way; for even after weeks of successful resistance to the importunities of the tempter a mere spark may rekindle the smothered flames. The road to intemperance is paved with mild stimulants, and the only safe, consistent and effective plan of reform is total abstinence from all stimulating poisons.

FELIX L. OSWALD.

Reformed Episcopal Church.—The latest deliverance of its General Council on the liquor question was in May, 1887, in the following words (unanimously adopted):

"*Whereas,* The enormous traffic in intoxicating liquors is one of the overshadowing evils of the day and a great obstacle to the advancement of Christ's kingdom on earth; and

"*Whereas,* It is painfully true that many professing Christians countenance or fail to oppose this great iniquity; therefore be it

"RESOLVED, (1) That all Christian men and women should, both by precept and example, uphold the cause of temperance, and do all in their power to suppress the liquor traffic. (2) That no Christian can consistently engage in this traffic, or profit by it, either by leasing or letting the buildings in which to carry it on, or otherwise. (3) That no Christian can consistently aid this traffic by signing petitions for license to engage in the same."

Reformed Presbyterian Church.—The General Synod, representing the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, during its national session held in May, 1889, declared:

"The Reformed Presbyterian Church has in the past stood forth as the champion of oppressed humanity. In the last great conflict she was among the foremost to lift her voice to condemn slavery and to demand the liberation of the slave. A mightier conflict is upon this nation to-day. . . . Inaction is opposition. We arraign the liquor traffic as the 'crime of crimes,' as the overshadowing curse of the age, as the prolific parent of vice, misery and pauperism. We arraign the saloon as the peculiar institution of the devil, as the inveterate foe of God and man, as the school of anarchy, as a constant menace to the home, the church and the State; as an uncontrolled and uncontrollable power that has successfully defied all restrictive laws. The logic of experience has demonstrated that there is but one effective remedy, namely, extermination—Prohibition."

Republican Party.[1]—Founded for the great object of opposing the aggressions of the slave power the Republican party, if viewed in the light of its original purpose, is justly characterized as "the party of moral ideas" and "the grand old party." Even if there is any lingering disposition to doubt the wisdom of its early aims or the beneficence of the resulting achievements, none will deny that it sprang from noble impulses. With a peculiar hope, therefore, a very large element of people have looked to this party to promote the legislative and other political interests of the temperance reform as old questions became settled and the issue against the liquor traffic became clearly defined. With a determination amounting to passionate skepticism multitudes have refused to believe that the accumulating evidences of the party's hostility have indicated its real tendency or have called for a withdrawal of their co-operation. Much has been expected, and an extraordinary faith has been reposed in the party: these facts suggest that here is an organization which has uniformly had a large constituency of progressive men and upon which grave responsibilities have been laid; consequently that the record made by it should be analyzed with scrupulous candor. For such an organization great allowances may be made; but on the other hand if the net results are unsatisfactory and the outlook for the future is discouraging conclusions must be stated with an emphasis proportioned to the disappointment.

The name "Republican" was first borne by the Anti-Federalist party in the early days of our national existence. The Federalists stood for a strong centralized Government, the Anti-Federalists or Republicans for the sovereignty of the States. The name was retained until 1805, when it was dropped and the new one, "Democratic party," was taken. Afterward the supporters of John Quincy Adams and opponents of Andrew Jackson called themselves "National Republicans" until their organization became known as the Whig party. Thus both the Democrats and Whigs, who divided the control of the Government for many years, were originally called Republicans.

THE SLAVERY ISSUE.

The downfall of the Whig party came at the Presidential election of 1852. It was foreshadowed by the utter rejection by its leaders of the demand that it should resist the encroachments of slavery, and by their willingness to speak in quite as strong terms against the Anti-Slavery policy as even the Democrats employed. This is strikingly shown by a comparison of the Democratic and Whig National platforms of 1852:

From the Democratic National Platform, adopted at Baltimore, June 1, 1852:

"Resolved, . . . That all efforts of Abolitionists or others, made to induce Congress to interfere with the questions of slavery, or to take incipient steps in relation thereto, are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences, and that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people and to endanger the stability and permanence of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friend of our political institutions.

"Resolved, That the foregoing proposition covers, and is intended to embrace, the whole subject of slavery agitation in Congress; and therefore the Democratic party of the Union, standing on this national platform, will abide by and adhere to a faithful execution of the act known as the Compromise measures of the last Congress—the act for reclaiming fugitives from service or

From the Whig National Platform, adopted at Baltimore, June 16, 1852:

"Resolved, That the series of acts of the 31st Congress known as the Compromise measures of 1850—the act known as the Fugitive Slave law included,—are received and acquiesced in by the Whig party of the United States as a settlement in principle and substance of the dangerous and exciting questions which they embrace; and so far as they are concerned we will maintain them and insist on their strict enforcement till time and experience shall demonstrate the necessity of further legislation to guard against the evasion of the laws on the one hand, and the abuse of their powers on the other—not impairing their present efficiency; and we deprecate all further agitation of the question thus settled, as dangerous to our peace, and will discountenance all efforts to continue or renew such agitation, whenever, wherever and however the attempt may be made;

---

[1] The editor is indebted to Rev. I. Villars, D.D.

labor included, which act, being designed to carry out an express provision of the Constitution, cannot with fidelity thereto be repealed nor so changed as to destroy or impair its efficiency.

"RESOLVED, That the Democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing, in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the slavery question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made."

and we will maintain this system as essential to the nationality of the Whig party and the integrity of the Union."

The men most interested in maintaining the policy thus defined regarded the Democratic party with greater confidence than the Whig, and consequently the the latter was overwhelmed. A period of seeming calm followed, and for a time it was really thought that the question was disposed of. The calm was broken by the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the virtual concession of full freedom to the slaveholders to introduce their system into all the Territories and erect new slave States. The passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill was secured May 27, 1854, after four months of discussion. "The advocates and opponents of slavery," says Mr. Blaine, "were invited to a trial of strength on the public domain of the United States. No previous Anti-Slavery excitement bore any comparison to that which spread over the North as the discussion progressed, and especially after the bill became a law. It did not merely call forth opposition—it produced amost a frenzy of wrath on the part of thousands and tens of thousands in both the old parties who had never before taken any part whatever in the Anti-Slavery agitation."[1] And speaking of the political developments of the agitation Mr. Blaine says: "A new party sprang into existence, composed of Anti-Slavery Whigs and Anti-Slavery Democrats. The latter infused into the ranks of the new organization a spirit and an energy which Whig traditions could never inspire. The same name was not at once adopted in all the States in 1854, but by the ensuing year there was a general recognition throughout the North that all who intended to make a serious fight against the pro-slavery Democracy would unite under the flag of the Republican party. In its very first effort, without a compact organization, without discipline, it rallied the Anti-Slavery sentiment so effectually as to carry nearly all the free States and to secure a plurality of the House of Representatives. The indignation of the people knew no bounds. Old political landmarks disappeared and party prejudices of three generations were swept aside in a day."[2]

But the Republican party did not at once propose the abolition of slavery or even the curtailment of the institution as it then existed in the Southern States. At its first National Convention (Philadelphia, June 17, 1856) the attitude of the party was thus defined:

"RESOLVED, That with our republican fathers we hold it to be a self-evident truth that all men are endowed with the inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and that the primary object and ulterior designs of our Federal Government were to secure these rights to all persons within its exclusive jurisdiction; that as our republican fathers, when they had abolished slavery in all our national territory, ordained that no person should be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law, it becomes our duty to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it for the purpose of establishing slavery in any Territory of the United States, by positive legislation prohibiting its existence and extension therein. That we deny the authority of Congress, of a Territorial Legislature, of any individual or association of individuals, to give legal existence to slavery in any Territory of the United States while the present Constitution shall be maintained.

"RESOLVED, That the Constitution confers upon Congress sovereign power over the Territories of the United States, for their government; and that in the exercise of this power it is both the right and the duty of Congress to prohibit in the Territories those twin relics of barbarism—polygamy and slavery."

To prohibit the extension of slavery was the fundamental object of the Republican party. There was no retreat from that position, but the views of the leaders became more and more aggressive. Thus, Abraham Lincoln in his famous speech at Springfield, Ill., June 17, 1858, accepting the nomination for United States Senator from Illinois, uttered these memorable words:

"'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved, I do not expect the house to fall, . . . but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will resist the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind will rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new. To meet and overthrow the power of that dynasty is the work now before all those who would prevent that consummation. This is what we have to do."

---

[1] Twenty Years of Congress, vol. 1, pp. 115-16.

[2] Ibid, pp. 117-18.

The accession of the Republicans to power in 1860 and the secession of the slave States were followed, in due course of time, by the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia and the Territories (1862), the Emancipation Proclamation[1] (Jan. 1, 1863), the complete subjugation of the Confederacy (1865), the adoption of the 13th (1866), 14th (1868) and 15th (1870) Amendments to the Federal Constitution, and the reconstruction of the revolted section. During the 24 years from 1861 to 1885 the party had unbroken possession of the Government, although President Johnson's Administration was not in harmony with its programme and the Democrats became masters of the House of Representatives and, for a brief period, of the Senate.

Upon the completion of the war and the legislation growing out of it there arose a belief that old party ties were no longer binding, that it was proper to enter into new affiliations and that new questions should be pushed to the front. Horace Greeley in 1872 led a defection from the Republican party. Many distinguished men, who had ardently supported the Republicans throughout the war, went over to the Democratic party. As early as 1874 (July 27) the New York *Evening Post* (then under the direction of William Cullen Bryant), representing the best political thought of the nation, made this comment upon the situation :

"The truth is that during all these years there has been no rallying point about which the opposition could honestly and unanimously gather, and the Republican party has now carried all its ends and has nothing further to offer to the people. The disintegration of both the late parties is complete. They have a name to live, but they are dead. What is it to be a Republican? No living man can answer that question. We have looked through the long address of the so-called Congressional Committee of the party to find a solid answer to that question, but we cannot find it. There is no answer to that question, because there is no single point of vital public policy at present on which those who call themselves Republicans are agreed. What is it to be a Democrat to-day? That question is easily put, but impossible to be answered, for the same reasons as before. The parties are dead. Let the people understand this once for all, and not let themselves be put in awe any longer by mere gibbering ghosts of what once was."

THE TEMPERANCE ISSUE—1854 TO 1866.

Just before the organization of the Republican party the Prohibition movement had swept a number of States. Credit is due the Democrats for most of the legislation of that period. (See p. 148.) It is proper to say, however, that the statutes were enacted in obedience to favorable votes of the people, and that if other parties had been in power in those States they would undoubtedly have passed similar measures. For example, Vermont's law was passed by the Whigs in 1852; and the Know-Nothings, Free-Soilers and Anti-Nebraska men participated in Prohibitory legislation in several States (notably Connecticut, Delaware, Massachusetts and Indiana). The election of Myron H. Clark as Governor of New York in the fall of 1854, with a Legislature in harmony with him, was substantially a victory for the then incipient Republican party; therefore the New York Maine law of 1855 may be regarded as a Republican act. In one other State—New Hampshire, 1855—Prohibition was adopted in part as a Republican measure, though the Governor who signed the bill was a Know-Nothing. But the new division of political parties was not completed until most of the legislative sessions of 1855 were ended, and by that time the feeling on the slavery question was so intense that interest in Prohibition ceased. Thus the Republican party, not having come to the front when conditions were favorable for action against the drink traffic, did not make conspicuous contributions to the early Prohibition successes. And its failure to do so in the years between 1855 and the opening of the Civil War—in which not a single original Prohibitory law was enacted[1]—is explained by the increasing fierceness of the Anti-Slavery contest and the decreasing importance of all other issues. Undoubtedly it would have been quick to respond to public sentiment then if public sentiment had been manifested and if, as in former years, there had been no special reasons to fear the political influence of the liquor-sellers; for many of the most eminent temperance leaders of the day were among the founders of the party, and a majority of the best elements of citizens in the North was with it.

---

[1] It is of interest to remember that the Emancipation Proclamation was not issued until after formal notice had been served upon the Confederacy that, if the authority of the Government were not recognized within a reasonable time, the slaves would be declared free. This notice implied that the Government was prepared to treat with the South on some other terms than abolition. And as late as February, 1865, only two months before Lee's surrender, President Lincoln submitted to the Cabinet a proposition to grant $400,000,000 of compensation for liberated slaves, one-half to be paid to the Confederate States in case they should cease armed resistance by the 1st of April, 1865, and the other half in case the 13th Amendment (abolishing slavery) should be ratified by the requisite number of States by the ensuing 1st of July. (See Nicolay and Hay's "Abraham Lincoln," vol. 10, pp. 133-4.)

With 1856 began the supremacy of the Republican party in the States of the North. For the next ten years its energies were absorbed by the gigantic task that had been prepared for it by its founders. Every other design that its individual members may have had was subordinated to the aim of strengthening its attitude on the slavery question and waging the conflict. Not only was Prohibition neglected but its interests were sacrificed. Whatever excuses may be made, however, for the repeals of Prohibitory laws, it is our duty to record the facts. The following is a list of the State measures abrogated or materially weakened in this period by the Republicans:[2]

New York.—The law of 1855 was declared unconstitutional in certain particulars by the Court of Appeals (see p. 90). The Republican Legislature of 1856 could have retained and strengthened those provisions which were not unconstitutional (pending a decision from the United States Supreme Court). But it preferred to repeal the act and to restore the license system.

Iowa.—The Republican Legislature of 1856, desiring to accomplish indirectly the destruction of the law of 1855, enacted a statute permitting County Judges to grant licenses in all counties voting for license. This was declared unconstitutional and therefore did not take effect. But the next Republican Legislature (1858) amended the law so as to permit the manufacture and sale of beer, cider and domestic wines.

Indiana.—The law of 1855, having been pronounced unconstitutional, was promptly wiped out by the Republicans in 1858, and no attempt was made to enact new Prohibitory legislation. A license law (placing the fee at $50) was substituted for it.

Rhode Island.—In 1863 the Republicans put an end to the Prohibitory law of 1852.

Michigan.—In 1861 the manufacture and sale of beer, wine and cider (with certain limitations, for which see p. 315), and the manufacture of "alcohol, 80 per cent. pure," for sale out of the State, were excepted from the prohibitions of the law of 1855.

Throughout these 10 years, on the other hand, the Prohibition system was maintained in the Republican States of Maine, Vermont, Massachusetts and Connecticut. But in New Hampshire the imperfections of the law of 1855 (tolerating the manufacture of liquors) were not remedied.

The blows dealt the Prohibition cause in this era in individual States were light compared with the one administered by the enactment of the Internal Revenue law (1862) and the subsequent amendments to it. This act gave the liquor traffic a legal footing in the nation, brought its representatives into close political relations with the Federal Government and, by creating an enormous liquor revenue, caused the people to look to it as a legitimate source of public income. But the Internal Revenue law in its inception was purely a war measure; and remembering that even at the present day some temperance leaders do not regard it as hurtful to their movement, it would be unfair to criticise the motives of the men who originated the law. Yet it is a fact that in adjusting its details great consideration was shown for the wishes and interests of both the distillers and the brewers; by providing that the act should not go into force until some months after its passage, and by making similar provisions when the liquor taxes were increased in later years, the distillers were enabled to make great profits by speculations; while the tax on beer was lowered for a time at the demand of the brewers.

---

[1] In Maine, however, the Democrats, who had enacted the original statute (1851) now became its opponents and the Republicans became its champions. At the election of 1854 the repeal of the Maine law was one of the issues, and it was understood that the repealers drew their strength chiefly from the Democrats. But the Republicans swept the State, electing the Governor and a majority in the Legislature; and at the session of 1855 this triumph was emphasized by a re-enactment and strengthening of the measure, intended, probably, to convince the people that the new party was thoroughly committed to it. But the election of 1855 gave the Democrats the Legislature, and as there was no choice of Governor by the people a Democrat was seated. Controlling all branches of the State Government, the Democratic party repealed Prohibition early in 1856 and re-enacted license. There was another great Republican victory at the polls in the fall of 1856, but Prohibition was not immediately re-established; to make sure of its position the party decided to test the sentiment of the people. The preference of the voters for the Republican party was again demonstrated at the September election of 1857. Accordingly in 1858 (March 20) the Prohibitory law was restored, but to settle all controversy the question was submitted to the electors whether they would have the Prohibitory act of 1858 or the license act of 1856. The popular vote was taken June 7, 1858, and resulted in 28,864 for Prohibition and 5,912 against it. The new measure took effect July 15, 1858.

The appearance of the Republican party in Maine revolutionized the politics of that State. It had formerly been reliably Democratic. The advocacy of rum by a large section of the Democratic party was responsible for its loss of power there. The championship of the two causes of Anti-Slavery and Prohibition established the supremacy of the Republican party in Maine.

[2] In Nebraska (then a Territory) the law of 1855 was killed by a Republican Legislature in 1858.

FROM 1866 TO 1876.

The termination of the war made the Republican party absolute master of the country. It proceeded to establish the results gained by extending the suffrage to the emancipated race and "reconstructing" the Southern States. In pursuance of this policy it encountered some opposition, but its majority was overwhelming, and everywhere there was a tendency among the people to recognize that new issues should now be made prominent. A very great (and perhaps not very discriminating) generosity is necessary if it is sought to account for the repeals of Prohibition in the years following the war on the ground that the exigencies of the distinctive work which the Republicans had to perform debarred them from giving fair attention to the claims of the temperance reform. The Prohibition agitation was renewed, the best citizens rallied to its support, and it could no longer be said that Prohibitory laws were dropped from the statutes because there was no organized feeling in behalf of their retention. The party that opposed this sentiment did so, therefore, at the risk of being regarded as deliberately hostile to the cause and to the representative and well-matured arguments of its advocates. But in order to show due respect for all possible objections the action of the party in the 10 years from 1866 to 1876 will be separately presented. This division indicates 1876 as the latest limit of the period in which the party's treatment of the temperance question may possibly be defended by charitable pleas.

At the beginning of the period there were encouraging signs in *Massachusetts.* The Prohibitory law was enforced there with much vigor. The liquor element at once organized to repeal it, and the Republicans quickly surrendered. One of their leading organs, the Boston *Transcript,* smoothed the way by saying: "What would be the verdict of history upon a political party that carried the Republic safely through a civil war, and then lost its influence in the nation by attempts to regulate the sale of cider and lager beer?" In 1868 the Legislature (Republican by four to one in the Senate and by 100 majority in the House) repealed Prohibition and enacted license. But in the next year, perceiving the dire effects of the new measure and obeying the almost unanimous demand of the respectable citizens, the Republicans re-enacted Prohibition. Again in 1870 a Republican Legislature catered to the wishes of the drink-dealers, the manufacture and sale of malt liquors being excepted. The opposition that this provision aroused caused the party, in 1871, to make the licensing of malt liquors subject to Local Option votes, and (in the same year) to establish a State Constabulary. Opposition continued, until, in 1873, the beer-exemption features were stricken from the statute. Then came earnest enforcement, giving rise to another formidable license conspiracy. The Republicans once more acquiesced in the wishes of the liquor people, and the Legislature of 1875 (Republican by 70 majority in the House and 8 in the Senate) definitely destroyed the whole Prohibitory law.

In *Connecticut* the work was done more rudely. The Legislature of 1867 (Republican by 46 majority in the House and 5 in the Senate) adopted a license act but held it in suspension. It was not approved at the next session. But in 1872 (the Republicans controlling the House by 21 majority and the Senate by 5) the Prohibitory system that had been in force for 18 years gave way to license.

In *Michigan*, after a vain attempt (1869) against the anti-license article of the Constitution, the Republicans for several years left the Prohibitory statute undisturbed, though doing nothing to improve it. In 1875 (with 6 majority in the House and 4 in the Senate) they rescinded it and substituted a tax measure. The State Supreme Court, soon afterward, declared that this act was not in conflict with the Constitution, and then the Legislature submitted to the people the question of removing the anti-license article. Finding that the article was of no practical value the people consented.

In 1874 Prohibition was re-established by the Republicans in *Rhode Island*. But the liquor-sellers were so strong in the party that they compelled it to change to license again in 1875 (the Republicans being in the majority by five to one in the House and nearly two to one in the Senate).

In *Iowa* and *New Hampshire* the weak Prohibitory laws were not strengthened. In *Maine* and *Vermont* few or no improvements were instituted, but there were no backward steps.

In the license States some progress was made, which was offset by reactionary developments. The Republican State Convention of 1868 in *New York* pledged Local Option, and the Legislature of 1873 passed an act in keeping with this pledge, but it was vetoed by Governor Dix (Rep.). Provision for Local Option by counties was made in *Pennsylvania* in 1872; but after many counties had adopted Prohibition the Legislature of 1875 (Republican in the Senate) voted to annul the measure and the Republican Governor (Hartranft) signed the repeal bill. In *Ohio*, despite the Woman's Crusade and other manifestations of powerful sentiment, there was no advance. Similarly in such Republican States as *Illinois*, *Wisconsin*, *Minnesota* and *Nebraska* nothing of consequence was done. But in *Kansas* the unorganized counties were placed under complete Prohibition (1867). Town Local Option was granted in *Connecticut*, but as we have seen (pp. 526–7) this was but slight compensation for the loss of State Prohibition.

During this period the Internal Revenue legislation was preserved by the Republican party, and more than once fraternal greetings were exchanged with the brewers by Government officials. (See UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.) The extensive "whiskey frauds" on the revenue belong to this time.

The National Republican party at its Convention in 1872 (Philadelphia, June 6) inserted in its platform the following, known as the Raster resolution:

> "The Republican party propose to respect the rights reserved by the people to themselves as carefully as the powers delegated by them to the State and Federal Government. It disapproves of the resort to unconstitutional laws for the purpose of removing evils by interfering with the rights not surrendered by the people to either the State or National Government."

In explanation of the meaning of this, Mr. Herman Raster, its author, wrote the following letter:

> "CHICAGO, ILL., July 10, 1872. J. M. Miller. —*Dear Sir:* In reply to yours of July 8, I have to say that I have written the sixteenth resolution of the Philadelphia platform, and that it was adopted by the Platform Committee with the full and explicit understanding that its purpose was the discountenancing of all so-called temperance (Prohibitory) and Sunday laws. This purpose was meant to be expressed by reference to the rights of the people which had not been delegated to either National or State Governments; it being assumed that the right to drink what one pleases (being responsible for the acts committed under the influence of strong drink), and the right to look upon the day on which Christians have their prayer-meetings as any other day, were among the rights not delegated by the people, but reserved to themselves. Whether this explanation of the meaning of the resolution will satisfy you, I do not know. But as you want to serve the cause of truth, so do I; and what I have stated here in regard to the true meaning and intent of the sixteenth resolution of the Philadelphia platform is the truth.
>
> "Very respectfully yours,
>
> "HERMAN RASTER."

It has been denied that Mr. Raster's statements were warranted by the facts. But 15 years later he repeated them, even more explicitly, to a correspondent of the *Voice*, and testimony supporting his declarations was obtained.[1]

There seems to be no doubt that the resolution was adopted because of Mr. Raster's dogged insistence and his threat that a large element of Germans would revolt from the party if it were rejected. It may also be true that the leaders of the party had little or nothing to do with the creation of it, and accepted it passively and perhaps with distrust. But the subject was thoroughly discussed in the Convention's Committee on Resolutions, which, with a full understanding of the significance of such an utterance, permitted the party to be bound by it. And it is certain that the liquor men showed their appreciation by heartily supporting the Republican ticket in 1872. At the Convention of the United States Brewers' Association, held in New York on the same day that the Republican National Convention met, Mr. Clausen, the President, said:

---

[1] See the "Political Prohibitionist for 1888," pp. 29, 142.

> "The Presidential election which takes place this fall may change the aspects of that [the Democratic] party. At the Cincinnati Convention they have placed at the head of their ticket a man [Horace Greeley] whose antecedents will warrant him a pliant tool in the hands of the temperance party, and none of you, gentlemen, can support him. It is necessary for you to make an issue at this election throughout the entire country, and although I have belonged to the Democratic party ever since I had a vote, I would sooner vote for the Republican ticket than cast my vote for such a candidate. [Cheers.]"

And the next year President Clausen, at the Brewers' Congress (Cleveland, June 4, 1873), alluding to the defeat of Mr. Greeley and the Republican victory, said:

> "The last Presidential election has shown us what unity among us can do. Let our votes and work in the future be heard from in every direction."

FROM 1876 TO 1891.

The steadily increasing zeal of the Prohibitionists in this third and last period has wrung concessions from all parties. The amount of liquor legislation enacted is unprecedented. Much of it is remarkable also for stringency. But when the strength of the movement is considered, the high respectability of its champions and the low and disreputable average character of its representative opponents, the results seem inadequate—especially inadequate in the States controlled by the party of "moral ideas." We briefly summarize the results in these States:

Kansas, Maine, South Dakota and *North Dakota* have secured Constitutional Prohibition by majority votes of their people. *Iowa* also decided for Constitutional Prohibition, but the State Supreme Court overthrew the Amendment for technical reasons, whereupon the Republican party enacted a complete Prohibitory law, which has been preserved. *Ohio*, too, showed a strong preference for this most radical form of anti-liquor law, but the Amendment did not become a part of the Constitution, and the Republicans though having full power to frame statutory Prohibition in subsequent years failed to do so, but set up the wretched Dow Tax law (with incidental Local Option) instead. *Rhode Island* gave a three-fifths vote for Constitutional Prohibition, but by intrigues and non-enforcement of the statute (for which the Republican party was largely responsible) a plot to repeal the Amendment was gradually developed; early in 1889 the Legislature (Republican by large majorities in both branches) voted to resubmit the question to the people; the next Legislature, in June, 1889 (also Republican in both branches) approved this action; the Republican managers labored for repeal at the popular election held to decide the issue, and, after the repeal had been consummated, their Legislature and Governor joined in enacting a license law.

More significant are the defeats of Constitutional Prohibition in the Republican States of *Michigan, Oregon, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Washington* and *Nebraska*, and the semi-Republican State of *Connecticut*. In all cases the weight of Republican influence was thrown to prevent the obtainment of popular majorities. In other States controlled in whole or in part by the Republicans, like *New York, New Jersey, Indiana, Wisconsin, Illinois, Minnesota, Colorado* and *California*, it has been the policy of the party to refuse the people opportunity to vote on Prohibitory Amendments at times when it has seemed probable or possible that such Amendments would be carried if submitted.

Much Local Option has been bestowed by the Republicans in this period, but as an alternative for State Prohibition. For example, the southern half of the Territory of *Dakota* gave a favorable majority in 1885 on the question of incorporating a Prohibitory Amendment in a prospective State Constitution; but the Republican Legislature, instead of passing a statute in harmony with the expressed desire of the electors, enacted County Local Option. *Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, Minnesota, Ohio, Nebraska* and *Illinois* are the typical States in which the Republicans have made Local Option concessions. In other States, like *New York* and *Pennsylvania,* even the poor boon of Local Option has been persistently denied.

The High License acts of *Nebraska, Illinois, Minnesota, Pennsylvania* and *Massachusetts,* the High Tax law of *Michigan,* the medium license laws of *New Jersey, Wisconsin, Oregon* and *Rhode Island,* the Dow law of *Ohio,* and measures of kindred character in some other States, originated with the Republican party. These, excepting possibly Nebraska's and Illinois's, were intended to be not progressive but obstructive, and they have been obstructive in fact, without any exception.

Legislation requiring scientific temperance instruction in public schools has been widely introduced, and the Republicans, always glad to find some means, short of Prohibition, for pleasing the temperance people, have permitted educational acts to pass in many States. Yet even these strictly non-political measures have been fought by Republicans at times, as in *Ohio.* Besides, while they have been more generally favored at the North by the Republicans than by the Democrats, the latter have supported them in noteworthy instances: the *New York* law was signed by a Democratic Governor and the *United States* law was passed by a Democratic House and received the approval of a Democratic President.

There is no more important result of the last decade's work than the incorporation of injunction and nuisance provisions in Prohibitory acts. Such provisions have been formulated by the Republicans in *Kansas, Iowa,* the *Dakotas* and (though less satisfactorily) *New Hampshire* and *Vermont.* The people, thoroughly believing in the principle of Prohibition, have demanded the most perfect instrument for its enforcement that could be devised, and the Republicans have given them the injunction and nuisance plan. In doing so, however, they have merely elaborated and made available a well-recognized common law remedy. And they have not uniformly taken the desired action: in *Rhode Island,* though they solemnly promised to strengthen the law by adding injunction features, they rejected an Injunction bill at two successive legislative sessions when put to the test.

Broadly surveying now the deeds of the party in the separate States we fail to discern grounds for much encouragement. Where the people have overwhelmed all political opposition by the ardor of their Prohibition enthusiasm the Republican party has executed their will, sometimes with seeming alacrity, sometimes reluctantly. Yet there are not wanting instances of absolute defiance of popular desire, and the examples of Rhode Island and Ohio are to be classed with the worst cases of Democratic hostility. The party leaders have endeavored to postpone and finally to defeat Prohibition oftener than they have consented to it. Their boasted High License has proved itself the most dangerous of compromises, practically worthless for all purposes save the purpose of retarding Prohibition and intrenching the traffic. Their Local Option cannot compare with the Local Option of the Democratic South. Their enforcement, while highly successful where the people will not brook violations, has been so imperfect in representative cities as to seriously embarrass the cause in the country at large.

Below are analyses of State Republican platforms for two important years:

1886.—Favoring the adoption of Prohibition, none; favoring the submission of the Prohibition question to popular vote, [1] Arkansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee and Texas—10; favoring High License and Local Option, Minnesota—1; impliedly favoring Local Option, New Jersey—1; favoring (with more or less definiteness) the continued maintenance of Prohibitory laws in Prohibition States, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont—5; favoring the strengthening or enforcement of license laws, Massachusetts and Michigan—2; indefinite expressions,[2] Alabama,

---

[1] These pledges were of no practical value. In Arkansas and Missouri the Republicans made no attempt to redeem their promise, and in all the other eight States here mentioned the Republican party managers (or the most influential of them) helped to defeat Prohibitory Amendments at the polls.

[2] The following, adopted by the Alabama Republican State Committee, is a specimen of these indefinite utterances:

"The organization of temperance men in Alabama meets our hearty approval, and we recognize in it the spirit of him who came among us and taught, 'A new command I give. I would that ye love one another.' "

Colorado, Connecticut, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin—6; favoring the liquor traffic, California—1; silent, Illinois, Nevada, New York, North Carolina and Rhode Island—5; no representative State meetings of the party held, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia—10.

1888.—Favoring the adoption of Prohibition, none; silent, Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia and Wisconsin—23; declaring for the continued support of Prohibitory laws in Prohibition States, Iowa, Kansas, Maine and Rhode Island—4; recognizing or alluding to the national aspects of the question,[1] Delaware, Massachusetts, Maine and Minnesota—4; favoring High License or Local Option, or both, Connecticut, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota aad New York—5; favoring the submission of Constitutional Prohibition, Nebraska and Pennsylvania—2; indefinite, New Hampshire and New Jersey—2.

The representative opinion of leaders and press shows a strong balance of sentiment against recognizing Prohibition as a policy to be embodied in the general tenets of the Republican party. Of course it would be unfair to cite individual expressions as conclusive if a reasonable doubt as to the prevailing view could be entertained. It may also be admitted that this dominant anti-Prohibition opinion, however emphatic, is merely the opinion of the past and the present, and does not necessarily indicate the opinion of the future; and that, concerning the tendency of future opinion, each individual may form his own views, governed by a recognition of past and existing circumstances. But this article would be defective if the truth were not frankly shown; and we believe no intelligent observer will doubt that the following citations display the average views of the authoritative leaders and organs upon the question of party advocacy of Prohibition:

James G. Blaine, candidate for President in 1884 (in a letter to the Philadelphia *Press*, Nov. 29, 1883): "Instead, therefore, of repealing the tax on spirits, the National Government can assign it to the States in proportion to their population. The machinery of collection is to-day in complete operation. A bill of 10 lines could direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the whole of it, less the small expense of collection, to the States and Territories in the proportion of their population, and to continue it permanently as a part of their regular annual revenues. . . . It [this plan] makes the taxes on spirituous and malt liquors a permanent resource to all the States, enabling them thereby definitely to readjust and reduce their own taxation." (For Mr. Blaine's definition of Prohibition as a State and not a national issue, see p. 109.)

Benjamin Harrison, President (in a speech at Danville, Ind., Nov. 26, 1887): "Heretofore the Republican party [of Indiana] has had some dalliance with the liquor traffic. . . . We said in our State platform that we were in favor of clothing local communities with power to act upon this question. There I stand, for one, to-day. I do not believe in State Prohibition as the best method of dealing with this question." (This speech, however, was a plea for Local Option, and Gen. Harrison took occasion in it to condemn the influence of the liquor element in politics. The vital point is, his practical recommendations went no farther than Local Option, but distinctly repudiated State Prohibition.)

John Sherman, United States Senator from Ohio (in a speech at Alliance, O., in 1873): "All parties, to be useful, must be founded upon political ideas which affect the framework of our Government, or the rights and immunities secured by law. Questions based upon temperance, religion, morality, in all their multiplied forms, ought not to be the basis of parties."

New York *Tribune*, Oct. 9, 1890: "The Republican party as a party is squarely committed to High License." The same paper said, June 20, 1889: "The outcome in Pennsylvania [defeat of the Prohibitory Amendment] is cause for general congratulation. It is a splendid triumph for High License."

Chicago *Tribune*, July 13, 1886: "In the great Western States the large majority of the beer-saloon-keepers are Republicans, and their patrons are largely Republicans. If they are to be stigmatized [by the Anti-Saloon Convention] as 'public enemies,' and dealt with as such, the inevitable result will be that they will find welcome shelter with the whiskey-Democratic party, and that the Republican party will lose thousands upon thousands of honorable votes, the loss of which cannot be made good." (It was this paper that gave utterance to the memorable opinion that "Prohibition must be prohibited in the Republican party.")

Cincinnati *Commercial Gazette*, Feb. 7, 1887:

---

[1] The most important of these utterances was the following, adopted by the Massachusetts Republican Convention (Boston, April 26), which was held for the purpose of electing delegates to the National Convention:

"The Republican party of Massachusetts has committed itself in favor of pronounced and progressive temperance legislation. It has demanded the restriction of the liquor traffic by every practicable measure, and now it calls upon the National Republican Convention to recognize the saloon as the enemy of humanity; to demand for the people the privilege of deciding its fate at the ballot-box; to insist that it shall be crippled by every restraint and disability which local public sentiment will sanction; in short, to take that attitude upon the temperance question which will win to the party all foes of the liquor traffic and all friends of good order."

Notwithstanding this apparently uncompromising "plank," the Republican party of Massachusetts, as an organization, ignored the merits of the Prohibitory Amendment question when it came up for decision the next year, and its representative newspapers and shrewdest politicians did all that was possible to defeat the Amendment.

“It is vain to say that the Republican party must and shall become a Prohibition party. It must and shall do no such thing. Those who are in it simply to make it so might as well go at once, for they will not succeed.” In its issue for Aug. 27, 1888, the *Commercial Gazette* said: “Hundreds of saloons in Ohio are substantially Republican club-houses.”

St. Paul *Pioneer Press*, Feb. 28, 1888: “The Republican party, nationally, is not a Prohibition party, and it is not likely to be so transformed at any future date. It does not recognize the liquor question as an issue properly national at all.”

Brooklyn *Times*, Aug. 5, 1886: “The temperance question is only one and not the most important of the great issues that make up the Republican party, and it is the question on which there is least agreement of sentiment within the party.”

Indianapolis *Journal*, June 21, 1888: “The Republican party is not in favor of Prohibition and cannot be placed in that position without palpable insincerity or duplicity on the part of the [National] Convention.” This is of especial interest because the *Journal*, at that time, was warmly advocating the claims of Gen. Benjamin Harrison for the Republican nomination for the Presidency, and felt that it was politic to reflect his anti-Prohibition ideas. After Harrison’s election and inauguration the Indianapolis *Journal* was known as his personal organ, and on Nov. 8, 1889, it printed a very significant editorial in which it said: “The Republican party, as a political party, has no identification nor sympathy with Prohibition as a political movement, and Republicans in all the State should so declare. That done, let it adopt High License, Local Option and restrictive police laws as a finality, and call a halt to agitation on the liquor question.”

New York *Mail and Express*, Nov. 18, 1889: “So the Republicans of Iowa are coming into line with Republicans elsewhere—in New York, in New Jersey, in Pennsylvania, in Illinois—in believing that the best temperance law is a judicious combination of Local Option and High License. It is the ground we have always occupied, and it is ground on which Republicans, if they stand together, can always win.”

As a national organization the party has not materially changed the position that it took in 1872. Its platforms in 1876, 1880 and 1884 contained no words that could be construed as repudiating the Raster resolution or suggesting a disposition to look with kindness upon the anti-saloon creed. At the National Convention of 1884 a formal plea was made before the Committee on Resolutions by Miss Frances E. Willard, President of the National Woman’s Christian Temperance Union. Miss Willard did not ask for a radical declaration but for a sympathetic one. She warned the party that many thousands of the best citizens were awaiting its action with the deepest solicitude and would sever their connection with it if practical words of encouragement were not spoken. The only response that the platform gave was a declaration that “the Republicans of the United States, in National Convention assembled, renew their allegiance to the principles upon which they have triumphed in six successive Presidential elections.”

Again in 1888 the Convention was besought to place the party in harmony with its temperance element. The Anti-Saloon Republicans, who had been striving for more than two years to induce the leaders to take up the question, sent a deputation, headed by H. K. Carroll, LL.D., of the New York *Independent*. Dr. Carroll made an impressive speech before the Platform Committee, reciting the moral, religious and political reasons why the Republicans should declare themselves foes to the drink traffic. He especially dwelt upon the importance of relieving the party of the incubus of the Raster resolution. Mrs. J. Ellen Foster also submitted recommendations. But the platform as adopted (June 21) gave no hint of a friendly purpose. On the other hand it embraced these words: “We reaffirm our unswerving devotion to . . . the autonomy reserved to the States under the Constitution; to the personal rights and liberties of the citizens in all the States and Territories in the Union.” This was interpreted by Herman Raster, author of the Raster resolution, as an implied repetition of that celebrated utterance.[1] Just before adjournment (June 25), the following, presented by C. A. Boutelle, and known as the Boutelle resolution, was passed:

> “The first concern of all good government is the virtue and sobriety of the people and the purity of the home. The Republican party cordially sympathizes with all wise and well-directed efforts for the promotion of temperance and morality.”

This Boutelle resolution, so indefinite in its terms, was not acceptable to any of the temperance leaders who had been inclined to independence. There was an understanding that it had been submitted to a prominent brewer before it was offered in the Convention, and had been approved by him.[2] The newspapers of the liquor traffic warmly commended it, particularly *Bonfort's Wine and Spirit Circular,* which said (July 10, 1888):

---

[1] See the *Voice*, June 28, 1888.

[2] Political Prohibitionist for 1889, p. 1[illegible]

> "And pray, who withholds indorsement from such propositions as these? In behalf of the wine and spirit trade, we hereby accord this declaration our unreserved approval. The man who would do otherwise would be very apt to contend that two and two do not make four."

The frank-spoken Republican organs did not hesitate to inform the temperance people that the party was no farther committed than it had been before. "The Boutelle resolution," said the Cincinnati *Commercial Gazette,* July 17, 1888, "was a simple piece of sentimentalism, equally harmless and unnecessary. If it had meant anything it wouldn't have passed."

It is needless to give additional illustrations. Those seeking more detailed information are referred to the "Political Prohibitionist" for 1888 and 1889. The relations of the Republican party to the drink trade as shown by its administration of Government affairs are indicated in brief in our article on UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Attached to this great organization are numberless individuals of intense temperance convictions. Among its recognized leaders are able men whose anti-saloon ideas are positive and undisguised. It is impossible to broach the Prohibition question in any hamlet, city or State where the Republican party is represented by its better elements without securing very cordial Republican support. This support is neutralized too often by political machinations, by local circumstances and by misleading issues; but there is no doubt that a host of Republicans is prepared at all times to sustain advanced measures, and that a scarcely less favorable tendency is latent in other hosts. The ultimate decision in the case of every reform rests with the people and not with their party organizations. Obstructive tactics, violent disavowals and artful expedients are temporarily successful, and may be successful for a long period of years. But with sufficient perseverance may come finally revolution. Knowing the strength and high respectability of the following already secured, and thoroughly believing in the soundness of their economic policy, the advocates of Prohibition feel assured that their cause will outlive and eventually subdue all party antagonism.

Restriction, broadly defined, is any legislative policy short of Prohibition that narrows the liquor traffic or the privileges and freedom of the persons engaged in it. By requiring the traffickers to pay license fees, even if no other conditions are prescribed, a certain restriction is effected, for the legal right to conduct the business is thereby limited to individuals who comply with the requirement. Similar restrictions are those which prescribe certain formalities of procedure to be observed by the would-be liquor-trader before he can be qualified to receive a license—such formalities as the filing of an application for license, certifying that the applicant is "of good moral character," etc., and signed by a specified number of neighboring property-holders or citizens, in some cases a small number being adequate and in others a large number, even a majority, being necessary; the filing of a bond obligating the licensee to observe all the provisions of the liquor laws, this bond to be guaranteed by one or more responsible persons, who become pecuniarily liable for any misconduct on the part of the licensee; and the procurement of consent from a Board of Excise, Board of Commissioners, Board of Aldermen or Council, Court, magistrate or other authority having jurisdiction over license applications. Other occasional restrictions antecedent to the granting of license provide that the applicant shall be a citizen of the United States and one who has never been convicted of offending against the law; that his bondsman or bondsmen shall reside in the ward, town, etc., where the liquor establishment is to be conducted, and shall not be pecuniarily interested in the sale of liquors; that the aggregate number of licenses issued shall be reducible to the ratio of one for a minimum number of inhabitants (as 300, 500 or 1,000); that the license shall not in any manner be transferred or disposed of (unless absolutely surrendered) by the holder, and shall not be continued in case of his death, etc.

Restrictions like these operate essentially to raise revenue for the Government, to determine the proportions of the traffic and to make license an exceptional privilege, more or less difficult of obtainment. Their peculiar effect is to circumscribe the bounds of legalization, yet to legalize to some extent and with certainty. It is true they imply that the Government recognizes in the liquor traffic a perilous institution which should be singled out for special discriminations; and the soundness of the Government's instinct is amply justified by practical results, for the men who apply for liquor licenses are, as a class, the very worst men in the community. But restrictions that deal merely with the method or extent of licensing have little to do with principle. They involve a limited sanction, but a sanction nevertheless. Therefore these are seldom regarded as restrictions proper by individuals who look upon the whole traffic as wrong and harmful. And in practice they are not frequently found to be genuine temperance restrictions: this is sufficiently demonstrated by the failure of the High License system. Indeed, the revenue features of license laws are believed to be the reverse of restrictive, for they create in licensees a strong incentive to increase their sales and so extend the consumption of liquor. But apart from the revenue features the regulations governing the manner and volume of licensing are not singly combated with any particular formality. The whole policy is condemned, yet if the license programme as a whole cannot be defeated the radicals are not disposed to manifest much interest concerning its details unless these details are clearly formulated with a view to giving the liquor-sellers special favors or intrenching their business.

Another class of restrictions embraces prohibitions that the dealers are expected to live up to in the conduct of their vocation. These are of very wide range, and, as expressed in the laws of the States, cover all conceivable devices for minimizing the evils of the traffic and the "abuse" of drink. Thus the sale to minors, common drunkards and intoxicated persons, insane and idiotic individuals, Indians, etc., is prohibited; the sale on Sundays and (in some States) on all holidays is unqualifiedly forbidden; saloon-keepers are not permitted to employ barmaids and are often required to exclude all women from their places; sales during certain hours of the night are unlawful; gambling must not be tolerated on licensed premises, and all games, as well as music, dancing, etc., are prohibited in a number of States; liquor-dealers are frequently required to have no screens on their premises and no obstructions to a clear view of the interior from the street; sometimes it is prescribed that no liquor shall be consumed in the place where sold; in other instances liquor cannot be sold for consumption on the premises unless meals are ordered by the purchasers; the practice of "treating" has been prohibited by certain statutes; wholesalers must not vend at retail; manufacturers in Prohibition localities must not sell to residents of those localities, etc. To sustain these various provisions penalties for violations are imposed, ranging in severity from a nominal fine to fine and imprisonment and revocation of license; while individuals injured in property, person or means of support in consequence of the sale of liquor are entitled to bring civil action for damages against the sellers and against the owners of the premises.

Such restrictions as those just noticed are uncompromising and are backed by principle. The Prohibitionists do not oppose but welcome them. Yet, being incidental to the license system, their practical value is comparatively slight. Knowing the unscrupulous character of the men who "sell rum for a livelihood," as well as the strong temptations that continually beset them, it is childish to hope that observance will be shown unless the consequences of disobedience are likely to prove very serious; and the influence of the traffic is nearly always powerful enough to keep the police inactive, or to avert prosecutions, or to perjure witnesses, or to prevent convictions by juries. In exceptional cases (notably where vigorous work has been done by Law and Order Leagues) the liquor-sellers have been compelled to respect the restrictive laws, but ordinary experience is highly discouraging.

Genuine restriction, then, as understood by the advanced temperance advocates, though unsatisfactory in results is not objectionable in principle or tendency. The word "restriction" does not excite antipathy, like "license," and is not misleading, like "regulation." But the coupling of license with restriction is distasteful to those who are conscientiously opposed to license. Accordingly it has often been suggested that a basis of agreement between the moderate and the radical temperance people might be reached through a policy of "restriction without license"—that is, a policy retaining and strengthening all the separate restraints of present license laws, but eliminating the feature of express sanction. This is proposed on the ground that so far as the law speaks concerning the status of the drink traffic or any other vicious business it should speak in words of prohibition—that if not prepared at once to prohibit the whole traffic, the State should prohibit certain features of it, as is now done, but without sanctioning those features not now forbidden, and without taking revenue from the business. (For a full discussion of this subject see the address delivered by I. K. Funk, D.D., in "Proceedings of the National Temperance Congress, Held in the Broadway Tabernacle, New York, June 11 and 12, 1890.")

[For the restrictions embraced in various liquor laws the reader is referred to LEGISLATION.]

Revenue.—SEE COST OF THE DRINK TRAFFIC and INTERNAL REVENUE.

Rhode Island.—See Index.

Riley, Ashbel Wells.—Born in Glastonbury, Hartford County, Conn., March 19, 1795; died in Rochester, N.Y., April 3, 1888. He took up his residence in Rochester in 1816 and was one of the first five village Trustees. When the village became a city he was made one of its Aldermen. In 1828 he was appointed Brigadier-General in the New York State Militia. While an Alderman of Rochester he began visiting the jail and distributing tracts among the prisoners. In 1836 with two other Aldermen he refused to grant licenses for the sale of liquor. He first became an advocate of Prohibition, as he stated in a speech before the International Temperance Conference at Philadelphia in 1876, while watching a tavern burn in a little town in Montgomery County, N. Y., and hearing the wife of a man who had been made a drunkard in that tavern exclaim, "Glory to God! I prayed for that." He was a strong Abolitionist, and the first Abolition meeting held in Rochester met in his house. He was also an ardent Sabbatarian and lost several thousand dollars in an attempt to sustain a Sabbath-observing line of boats on the Erie Canal. He began lecturing for temperance about 1838. Though not an educated man he was a very effective agitator. Some of his methods were novel. Sometimes he paid liquor-sellers to come and hear him. Prof. A. A. Hopkins says: "Gen. Riley was the first total abstinence worker to use the pledge in a systematic fashion." A medal which he presented to pledge-signers bore a picture of the "old oaken bucket;" more than 6,000 of these medals were distributed. He paid his own expenses and worked for the love of the cause, travelling extensively and making several thousand speeches in the United States, and lecturing also in various parts of the United Kingdom, France and Italy. The mother of Miss Frances E. Willard took the pledge after listening to one of his addresses. A thorough-going radical, he believed in the principles of the Prohibition party and cast his sixty-eighth annual ballot for its ticket.

Roman Catholic Church.—From very early times it has been the universal practice of priests in the confessional to administer the total abstinence pledge as a penance to persons addicted to the excessive use of intoxicants, and to make abstinence on the part of such persons a condition of partaking of the sacraments. The attitude of the church in this country in relation to the use and sale of alcoholic beverages is stated in the decrees issued by the 3d Plenary Council of Roman Catholic Prelates in the United States, held at Baltimore in 1884–5. Of these decrees the following are the most important ones touching temperance:

"113. A Christian should carefully avoid not only what is positively evil, but what has even the appearance of evil, and more especially whatever commonly leads to it. Therefore Catholics should generously renounce all recreations and all kinds of business which may interfere with keeping holy the Lord's day, or which are calculated to lead to the violation of the laws of God or of the State. The worst, without doubt, is the carrying on of business in barrooms and saloons on Sunday, a traffic by means of which so many and such grievous injuries are done to religion and society. Let pastors earnestly labor to root out this evil; let them admonish and entreat; let them even resort to threatenings and penalties, when it becomes necessary. They should do all that belongs to their office to efface this stain, now nearly the only blot remaining among us, obscuring the splendor of the day of the Lord.

"260. There is no doubt but that among the evils we especially deplore in this country the abuse of intoxicating drinks is to be numbered, for this excess is the constant source of sin and the fruitful origin of misery. Utter ruin has thereby come to innumerable individuals and whole families, and it has dragged many souls headlong to eternal destruction. And, since this vice has spread not a little even among the Catholics, scandal is thus given to non-Catholics and a great obstacle is set up against the spread of religion. Both love of religion and of country therefore urge all Christians to use every effort to stamp out this pestiferous evil.

"261. It is from the priests of the Church that we especially hope for assistance in this work; for upon them has God imposed the duty of imparting the Word of Life, and of propagating sound morality among the people. Let them never cease to cry out boldly against drunkenness, and whatsoever leads to it; and let this be done more especially during such seasons of devotion as retreats and missions. Let them bear in mind the teaching of the Apostle and earnestly admonish their people that 'drunkards shall not inherit the kingdom of God.' (I Cor. 6:10.) Those of their flocks who presumptuously deem themselves above the danger of temptation should be warned that 'he that loveth the danger shall perish in it.' (Ecclesiasticus 3:27.) And since the moving force of instruction should be strengthened by the attractive power of good example, the clergy themselves should in this matter be patterns to their flocks, exhibiting in their own conduct living models of the virtue of temperance.

"262. Following in the footsteps of the Fathers, the other councils of Baltimore, and supported by the teachings of the Angelic Doctor, we heartily approve and commend the praiseworthy custom of many who in our day abstain entirely from the use of intoxicating liquors, thus to overcome more certainly the vice of intemperance, either by removing from themselves the occasions thereof or by presenting to others a splendid example of the virtue of temperance, whose zeal we willingly admit is according to knowledge and has already brought forth abundant fruit and promises still greater in the future.

"263. Lastly, we warn our faithful people who sell intoxicating liquors to consider seriously by how many and how serious dangers and occasions of sin their business—although not unlawful in itself—is surrounded. If they can, let them choose a more honorable way of making a living; but if they cannot, let them study by all means to remove from themselves and others the occasions of sin. Let them not sell drink to the young—that is, to those who are not of age,—nor to those who they foresee will abuse drink. Let them keep their saloons closed on Sundays, and at no time let them allow blasphemy, cursing or obscene language within the walls of their taverns. If through their culpable neglect of co-operation religion is brought into contempt and souls ruined, they must know that in Heaven there is an Avenger who will exact the severest punishment from them."

These declarations of the Plenary Council, and the principles and work of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union (see CATHOLIC TEMPERANCE SOCIETIES), were recognized and warmly commended by the present Pope, Leo XIII., in a letter to Bishop Ireland of Minnesota, as follows:

"TO OUR VENERABLE BROTHER, JOHN IRELAND, BISHOP OF ST. PAUL, MINN., LEO XIII., POPE.—*Venerable Brother:* Health and apostolic benediction. The admirable works of piety and charity by which our faithful children in the United States labor to promote not only their own temporal and eternal welfare but also that of their fellow-citizens, and which you have recently related to us, give to us exceeding great consolation. And above all we have rejoiced to learn with what energy and zeal, by means of various excellent associations, and especially through the Catholic Total Abstinence Union, you combat the destructive vice of intemperance. For it is well known to us how ruinous, how deplorable is the injury both to faith and to morals that is to be feared from intemperance in drink. Nor can we sufficiently praise the prelates of the United States who recently in the Plenary Council of Baltimore with weightiest words condemned this abuse, declaring it to be a perpetual incentive to sin and a fruitful root of all evils, plunging the families of the intemperate into the direst ruin, and drawing numberless souls down to everlasting perdition; declaring moreover that the faithful who yield to this vice of intemperance become thereby a scandal to non-Catholics, and a great hinderance to the propagation of the true religion.

"Hence we esteem worthy of all commendation the noble resolve of your pious associations, by which they pledge themselves to abstain totally from every kind of intoxicating drink. Nor can it at all be doubted that this determination is the proper and the truly efficacious remedy for this very great evil; and that so much the more strongly will all be induced to put this bridle upon appetite by how much the greater are the dignity and influence of those who give the example. But greatest of all in this matter should be the zeal of priests, who, as they are called to instruct the people in the word of life and to mould them to Christian morality, should also and above all walk before them in the practice of virtue. Let pastors, therefore, do their best to drive the plague of intemperance from the fold of Christ by assiduous preaching and exhortation, and to shine before all as models of abstinence, that so the many calamities with which this vice threatens both church and State may by their strenuous endeavors be averted.

"And we most earnestly beseech Almighty God that, in this important matter, he may graciously favor your desires, direct your counsels and assist your endeavors; and as a pledge of the Divine protection, and a testimony of our paternal affection, we most lovingly bestow upon you, Venerable Brother, and upon all your associates in this holy league, the apostolic benediction.

"Given at Rome, from St. Peter's, this 27th day of March, in the year 1887, the tenth year of our Pontificate.

"LEO XIII., POPE."

As the attitude of the Roman Catholic clergy of the United States was defined by the decrees already quoted, so the views of the laity were declared by the 1st Congress of Catholic Laymen, held in Baltimore in November, 1889. The deliverances of that Congress embraced the following:

> "We should seek alliance with non-Catholics for proper Sunday observance. Without going over to the Judaic Sabbath we can bring the masses over to the moderation of the Christian Sunday. To effect this we must set our faces sternly against the sale of intoxicating beverages on Sunday. The corrupting influence of saloons in politics, the crime and pauperism resulting from excessive drinking, require legislative restriction, which we can aid in procuring by joining our influence with that of the other enemies of intemperance. Let us resolve that drunkenness shall be made odious and give practical encouragement and support to Catholic temperance societies. We favor the passage and enforcement of laws rigidly closing saloons on Sunday and forbidding the sale of liquors to minors and intoxicated persons."

In the controversy between the supporters of High License and restriction and the radicals who insist on absolute Prohibition, the church does not formally take sides. The Catholic Prohibitionists naturally derive much comfort, as well as weighty arguments, from the strong utterances of the Plenary Council and the words of the Pope. But it seems to be understood at present that most of the Catholic leaders hold conservative opinions so far as legislative policy is concerned—that is, while prepared to approve High License and similar measures they seem to be slow to urge complete Prohibition as the sole remedy. On the other hand Prohibition sentiment is steadily gaining ground, and there is no doubt that many of its important champions are influential Catholics.

Some of the most pronounced and memorable of all utterances on drinking and drink have come from fathers of the church and very eminent contemporary prelates. In the 8th Century St. Boniface, in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, administered this rebuke:

> "It is reported that in your diocese the vice of drunkenness is too frequent, so that not only certain Bishops do not hinder it but they themselves indulge in excess of drink and force others to drink till they are intoxicated. This is certainly a great crime for a servant of God to do or to have done, since the ancient canons decree that a Bishop or a priest given to drink should either resign or be deposed."[1]

St. Thomas Aquinas, the "Angelic Doctor" referred to in the Plenary Council decrees, who lived in the 13th Century, taught that "There are things contrary to soundness or a good condition of life, and the temperate man does not use these in any measure, for this would be a sin against temperance."[2]

Among the highly distinguished Catholic divines of this day Cardinal Manning (England) and Archbishop Ireland (United States) are especially emphatic in speaking for the abolition of the saloon. (It should be said by way of qualification, however, that both Cardinal Manning and Archbishop Ireland have shown a tendency to accept compromise legislation while waiting for complete Prohibition.) In a celebrated speech at Bolton, Eng., Cardinal Manning said:

> "I impeach the liquor traffic of high crimes and misdemeanors against the commonwealth, and I ask you, in the name of common sense and common justice, can you withhold from those intrusted with the high responsibility of the ballot the power of applying their votes in the form of a veto when it is proposed, without consulting them, to put in the midst of them these places for the sale of intoxicating drinks? . . . It is mere mockery to ask us to put down drunkenness by moral and religious means, when the Legislature facilitates the multiplication of incitements to intemperance on every side. You might as well call upon me as the captain of a sinking ship, and say: 'Why don't you pump the water out?' when you are scuttling the ship in every direction. If you will cut off the supply of temptation I will be bound by the help of God to convert drunkards; but until you have taken off this perpetual supply of intoxicating drink we never can cultivate the fields. You have sub-

---

[1] Discipline of Drink, by Rev T. E. Bridgett (London, 1876), p. 77.

[2] Summæ Theologicæ (Parma, 1854), Quæstio cxli, art. 6.

merged them, and if ever we reclaim one portion you immediately begin to build upon it a gin palace or some temptation to drink. The other day, when a benevolent man had established a sailors' home, I was told there were two hundred places of drink round about it. How, then, can we contend against these legalized and multiplied facilities and temptations to intoxication? This is my answer to the bland objurgation of those who tell us the ministers of religion are not doing their part: let the Legislature do its part and we will answer for the rest."

Archbishop Ireland, in an address before the Minnesota Catholic Total Abstinence Union, June 5, 1889, at Minneapolis, said, in part:

"We thought we meant business years ago in this warfare, but I hope God will forgive us for our weakness, for we went into the battlefield without sufficient resolution. We labored under the fatal mistake that we could argue out the question with the rumsellers. We imagined that there was some power in moral suasion, that when we would show them the evil of their ways they would abandon the traffic. We have seen that there is no hope of improving in any shape or form the liquor traffic. There is nothing now to be done but to wipe it out completely."[1]

The relations of individual Catholics to the drink traffic were graphically stated by Archbishop Ireland in an article in the *Catholic World* for October, 1890, the occasion being the centennial anniversary of the birthday of Father Mathew:

"In the centennial of Father Mathew there is a deep significance. It speaks to us, in accents that will not be stilled, of our own duty. Intemperance is among us, doing fearful harm to bodies and to souls. It has not the unlimited sway which former years accorded to it: there are serried battalions in the field opposing it. Public opinion no longer fawns to it; both its victims and its agents are held in ill-repute. Yet, withal, the slimy serpent lives, and through all ranks of society it trails its poison-laden lengths, distilling in all directions its pestilential breathings. Who is there who has not sorrowed over its ravages? Let me speak as a Catholic. . . . Intemperance to-day is doing Holy Church harm beyond the power of pen to describe, and unless we crush it out Catholicity can make but slow advance in America. I would say, intemperance is our one misfortune. With all other difficulties we can easily cope, and cope successfully. Intemperance, as nothing else, paralyzes our forces, awakens in the minds of our non-Catholic fellow-citizens violent prejudices against us and casts over all the priceless treasures of truth and grace which the church carries in her bosom an impenetrable veil of darkness. Need I particularize? Catholics nearly monopolize the liquor traffic; Catholics loom up before the Criminal Courts of the land, under the charge of drunkenness and other violations of law resulting from drunkenness, in undue majorities; poorhouses and asylums are thronged with Catholics, the immediate or mediate victims of drink; the poverty, the sin, the shame that fall upon our people result almost entirely from drink, and, God knows, those afflictions come upon them thick and heavy! No one would dare assert, so strong the evidence, that the disgrace from liquor-selling and liquor-drinking taken from us, the most hateful enemy could throw a stone at us, or that our people would not come out in broad daylight before the country as the purest, the most law-abiding, the most honored element in its population."

Ross, William.—Born in London, Eng., Dec. 25, 1812; died in Dover, Ill., Dec. 18, 1875. As a boy he learned to drink at the table of his father, who was a Colonel in the British army, stationed at Montreal, Canada. He had many wild youthful escapades, became dissipated and at 20 was turned into the street one cold night by a tavern-keeper, with whom he was boarding. A gentleman found him lying in the snow, his hand having been crushed by the door as it was shut after him. A few days later, with his arm in a sling, he made his first temperance speech at Rochester, N. Y. Soon after this he was led to devote his life to fighting the drink curse by a tragic circumstance. His twin sister, wife of a British army officer, was killed by a blow from a glass thrown by her husband in a fit of drunken passion at a servant. Mr. Ross studied medicine at Woodstock, Vt., that he might be better prepared to treat the subject of alcohol from a pathological point of view. In his earlier lectures he carried a small still by means of which he illustrated the adulteration of liquors. He lectured extensively in nearly every State of the East, South and North, and in central New York. At the outbreak of the Civil War he was living in Missouri, but was compelled, because of Union principles, to move to Illinois. He entered actively into the campaign of 1864 for the Republican party. In his temperance work he early became convinced that "moral suasion for the victim, legal suasion for the victimizer" was the true basis upon which the reform should be wrought out, and for him is claimed the honor of introducing and having adopted by the State Temperance Convention at Bloomington, Ill., Dec. 9, 1868, the first unqualified Prohibition party resolution enunciated by a State temperance organization. The platform, as originally presented in this Convention, made the following declaration: "We accept the issue made by the liquor-dealers and Beer Congresses and will meet them at the polls." At the instance of Dr. Ross this amendment was added: "and in support of these sentiments we will proceed to form a Prohibition party."

---

[1] The *Voice*, June 13, 1889.

Royal Templars of Temperance.—This Order was originally organized in Buffalo, N. Y., in 1869, as a league of temperance workers who were members of the Good Templars, Sons of Temperance and Temple of Honor, the object being to labor "unceasingly for the promotion of the cause of temperance, morally, socially, religiously and politically." It was intended to be wholly educational in its methods, and no special efforts were made to establish the Order outside the city of Buffalo. In February, 1877, it was reorganized on the present basis as a beneficiary insurance Order. The membership consists of beneficiary members and honorary members. At the end of 1889 there were 15,349 beneficiary members and 4,679 honorary members—total, 20,028. The expenditures for the year 1889 were $272,672.49, divided as follows: general fund, $13,874.18; beneficiary fund, $258,069.91; additional benefit, $120.92; propagation fund, $607.48. The newspapers of the Order are the *Royal Templar*, published at Buffalo, N. Y., and the *International Royal Templar*, published at Hamilton, Ont.

Rum.—See SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS.

Rum Power.—A name for the organized liquor traffic, having much the same significance that the term "slave power" formerly had. The "rum power" is that great political factor, embracing all who are pecuniarily interested in the traffic and their immediate followers, which stands ready to resist, by open or secret warfare, all Prohibitory or restrictive legislation, to prevent the enforcement of statutes, to intimidate parties and to fill the public offices with pro-liquor partisans. (See pp. 384–5.)

Rush, Benjamin.—Born at Bristol, Pa. (near Philadelphia), Dec. 24, 1745; died in Philadelphia, April 19, 1813. He was of Quaker extraction, his grandfather having joined William Penn's settlers in 1683. He was educated at Princeton College, graduating in 1760; studied medicine in Philadelphia and Edinburgh, and had hospital experience in London and Paris; was appointed Professor of Chemistry in the Philadelphia Medical College in 1769, and became a very successful practitioner and a voluminous writer on medical subjects. He is sometimes called "The Sydenham of America." For years he was recognized as the most eminent medical man of Philadelphia, if not of America. A very close friend of Benjamin Franklin's. he was, like that philosopher, abstemious and regular in his personal habits. Though his scientific tastes were keen he was above all a man of public spirit. He retained his connection with the Philadelphia Medical College until that institution was consolidated with the University of Pennsylvania (1791), and then he became a professor in the University. He took especial interest in all studies and work designed to alleviate the worst plagues of the race. During the yellow fever epidemic in Philadelphia in 1793 he was untiring; he is credited with having saved several thousand lives at that time, personally ministering to more than a hundred patients each day. Chosen a member of the Continental Congress of 1776 he was one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. He was also a member of the Constitutional Convention of 1787. He withdrew from politics in 1787, but was recalled to the public service in 1799, when he was appointed Treasurer of the United States Mint, a position that he held until his death. He took a prominent part in organizing the first Anti-Slavery society in this country (1774) and was its Secretary for many years. All movements for the advancement of philanthropy, religion and humanity's cause generally found a cordial friend in him. When his professional success was assured he devoted one-seventh of his income to charitable purposes.

The publication in 1785 of Dr. Rush's famous essay on "The Effects of Ardent Spirits on the Human Body and Mind," marks the beginning, in English-speaking countries, of formal discussion of the drink evil. Despite the utterances and efforts that had preceded it, no deep or lasting impression had been made by them. It can truly be said that before this essay was printed there was no such thing in existence as an extended, weighty and well-sustained argument of practical character against the use of strong drink. The injunctions and warnings of Scripture, the declarations of prominent men of all periods of the world's history, the prohibitions and restrictions of early English and American liquor legislation, were merely detached pleas and suggestions that commended themselves to the judgment of reflecting and virtuous people, but had never impelled a writer of respectable parts to make a studied attack upon the customs and prejudices of the day or to lay foundations for a distinct propaganda. True, Dr. Rush did not create an organized following, and the results of his work, if judged by responsive public manifestations, seem to have been meagre in his day. Yet his pamphlet, read by most of the thoughtful Americans of the time, had a convincing effect upon many minds, and did much to raise up special advocates of reform and to establish the general sentiment that began to take shape soon after the opening of the 19th Century. In England the *Gentleman's Magazine* reprinted it in 1786, and Dr. Rush made special efforts to extend its circulation, presenting copies to religious and other organizations. The value and influence of this essay are considered so important by the temperance people of the present day that a Centennial Temperance Conference was held in Philadelphia in 1885 to commemorate the one hundredth year since its publication.

The essay assails distilled spirits only, and even commends beer and wine. It was natural for early writers to view the weaker intoxicants with some favor, for scientific testimony against them was then scant and the evils of spirit-drinking were overshadowing. In an age when it was thought proper and indeed essential to take the most fiery liquors, and scarcely discreditable to indulge in them beyond ordinary bounds, an unusual courage and clearness of perception was necessary to speak uncompromisingly against them. Dr. Rush not only spoke uncompromisingly but laid out nearly all the fundamental lines of argument along which the present temperance movement is pressed. He showed that distilled spirits should never be used except in extreme cases. He described their effects upon the victim in striking words:

> "In folly it causes him to resemble a calf; in stupidity, an ass; in roaring, a mad bull; in quarreling and fighting, a dog; in cruelty, a tiger; in fetor, a skunk; in filthiness, a hog, and in obscenity, a he-goat."

He alluded to the hereditary and deranging influences of spirituous drink, and urged physicians to exercise great caution in prescribing it. He declared with the utmost positiveness that such drink was of no value for sustaining the body either in very cold or in very hot weather, or in times of manual or mental labor. He warned his readers against tobacco. He laid stress on the reminder that "no man ever became suddenly a drunkard." He besought ministers of the gospel and church organizations to help in the reform, and pointed out the political danger of being "governed by men chosen by intemperate and corrupted voters." He mentioned the desirability of legislation. Finally he pronounced against the "tapering-off" plan, saying that drinkers should abstain "suddenly and entirely."

It is most interesting to note that among the substitutes for spirits recommended by Dr. Rush (and recommended not once but several times), prominence is given to opium. In the very last words he speaks of laudanum as one of the temporary substitutes whose employment for effecting a transition to sober habits he has "never known to be attended with any bad effects." In another place he says that "wine and opium should always be preferred to ardent spirits;" that "they are far less injurious to the body and mind than spirits, and the habits of attachment to them are easily broken after time and repentance have removed the evils they were taken to relieve." When Dr. Rush published his essay, the opium habit was not widespread in America or England; its terrors were not generally known; De Quincy had not penned his "Confessions" and Coleridge had not written his despairing words: "Carmen reliquum in futurum tempus relegatum—To-morrow! and To-morrow! and To-morrow!" Neither had England fairly entered upon the work of enslaving China. But the formal endorsement of so fearful a drug by a scientific writer in a work especially designed to combat ignorance and temptation and to serve a philanthropic purpose, is exceedingly instructive. The fact that a man like Dr. Rush, in the light of the meagre scientific testimony and the restricted observation of his time, did not hesitate to approve opium, is a sufficient answer to all who may be disposed to cite his authority in behalf of malt and vinous liquors.

Russell, John, first candidate of the Prohibition party for Vice-President of the United States; born in Livingston County, N. Y., Sept. 20, 1822. His parents came from New Jersey and were of Puritan descent. In 1838 they removed to Michigan. John acquired his education in the district school, but improved it by reading and study. At the age of 21 he became a Methodist minister in the Detroit Conference. He had pastoral charges in Port Huron, Romeo, Ypsilanti, Flint, Pontiac, Marquette and Detroit. For eight years he was a Presiding Elder. He was a delegate to the General Conference in 1860 and 1880. In the last-mentioned year he was Chairman of the Special Committee on Temperance and wrote the important report submitted by it. The following words, still included in the doctrine of his church, are from his pen: "Voluntary total abstinence from all intoxicants as the true ground of personal temperance, and complete legal Prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating drinks as the duty of civil government." He has been chosen as one of the four delegates from the Detroit Conference to the second Ecumenical Conference of the Methodist Church, to be held in New York in 1891. As a temperance advocate and Prohibitionist he has become very prominent. For eight years he was the Temperance Agent of his Conference, for 12 years at the head of the Good Templars in Michigan, for two years the head of the world-wide Order and for two years Right Worthy Grand Lodge Lecturer. In performing the duties of these positions he labored in 24 States and the Dominion of Canada; he also spent some time in Great Britain and France. He is known as the "Father of the Prohibition party," having published the first newspaper that advocated the formation of a separate political party (see p. 573), and having taken steps that led to a meeting of Prohibitionists in Detroit in 1867, at which the new party's organization in Michigan had its birth. The reports on "political action" for four successive years beginning with 1867, adopted by the Right Worthy Grand Lodge of Good Templars, were written by him. He was Temporary Chairman of the Convention that founded the National Prohibition party, and for years he filled the most important places. At the Nominating Convention of 1872 he was made the candidate for Vice-President. Many of the most logical and striking articles appearing in Prohibition newspapers have been contributed by him.

Russia.[1]—In the 10th Century, when Vladimir of Russia, then a pagan, resolved to adopt a new religion, he curtly rejected the claims of Mohammedanism because of its founder's prohibition of liquor, giving as his reason that drinking was "a joy to the Russian heart." Thus from that distant time the people of this nation have been free to gratify their taste for drink uninfluenced by religious scruples. The original Russian beverages were mead and beer, fermented from honey and barley, respectively; and to this day no other ones are mentioned in the old songs.. The distilled vodka, which is now the national intoxicant, came into use gradually, until under Nicholas its supremacy was no longer to be questioned and all the vodka-shops were graced with the imperial shield of the double-headed eagle and were commonly styled the Czar's, the liquor business being then practically a Government monopoly. In January, 1863, the present system of indirect or Excise taxes on the manufacture and sale was introduced. The regulations for distilleries are very strict. Besides levying Excise duty on the manufacture of all liquors

---

[1] For the Government statistics in this article the editor is indebted to Peter Popoff of the Russian Consulate-General, New York; for other particulars to Axel Gustafson and Joseph Malins.

(excepting wines) the Government requires every vendor to take out an annual license. The official report for 1888 shows the following items of revenue:

Excise duty on alcohols, 237,138,344 roubles; on vodka made out of grapes and fruits, 831,659 roubles; on vodka made out of alcohol, 1,239,430 roubles; on beer and mead, 5,134,823 roubles; on malt, 1,469,434 roubles; licenses to distillers, wholesale and retail dealers, 18,293,719 roubles; duty on lands under distilleries, 361,361 roubles; fines for violations of the Excise rules, 443,439 roubles; different items, 70,585 roubles—total liquor revenue, 264,982,794 roubles, or about $132,500,000, reckoning a rouble at 50 cents.

This liquor revenue was more than 32 per cent. of the entire Government income in 1888, and was more than twice as large as any other item, the next highest items being the land tax (115,000,000 roubles) and the customs duties (110,000,000 roubles).

In 1886 there were 2,331 distilleries operating, and their product aggregated 31,420,408 vedro of pure alcohol, equivalent to about 78,550,000 vedro of vodka (vodka being 40 per cent. strong), or 250,000,000 United States gallons of distilled beverages. To produce this the distillers destroyed 80,793,407 pood about (1,300,000 tons) of potatoes, 30,523,340 pood (about 500,000 tons) of rye, and smaller quantities of green malt, dry malt, beets, corn, wheat, millet, barley, oats, etc. The potatoes used in distillation came chiefly from the Polish, Baltic and middle provinces, the grain from Siberia, Turkestan and the middle provinces, and the beets from Little Russia.

There were 1,407 beer and 556 mead breweries in 1886, and reckoning on the basis of the Excise duty (16.7 kopecks, or about 8.4 cents per vedro of beer) it appears that about 30,000,000 vedro (96,000,000 United States gallons) of beer was manufactured in that year. The production of mead was probably less than 10,000,000 gallons.

The wine yield, according to official data collected by the Minister of State Domains in 1889, was about 20,000,000 vedro (64,000,000 United States gallons). There were 170,000 desiatine (459,000 acres) devoted to viticulture. No Excise duty is levied on wines, and this fact accounts for conflicting estimates of the quantity of wine produced.

The imports and exports of liquors nearly balance each other. In 1888 the value of liquors exported was 8,234,874 roubles (the chief item being alcohol and corn spirits, 7,841,349 roubles), and the value of imported intoxicants was 7,697,931 roubles (the chief item being wines, 6,180,289 roubles).

The immense importance of the drink traffic as a source of Government revenue undoubtedly bars temperance progress. Mr. Thomas Stevens, one of the most observant of recent American travellers in Russia, states the truth with much force:

> "I have said more about vodka-drinking," he writes, "than I intended to in this paper. The evil of it is so prominently to the fore, however, and the subject so prolific that when once entered upon it is hard to get away from. That vodka-drinking is at the root of three-fourths of the misery one sees in Russia I am already fully persuaded. The evil is enormous, but the remedy is not so easily found. The revenues are correspondingly enormous, and the universal adoption of temperance by the peasantry would bankrupt the Government at once. The revenues from vodka pay the expenses of both army and navy."

He reports an interview with a representative citizen of the mir (or community) of Volosova, which, according to Mr. Stevens, comes "near being an ideal mir."

> "The secret of the prosperity of Volosova," said this citizen, "is that we voted to have no vodka-shop in the mir—that, and nothing else. Every mir has the privilege of Local Option. It remains with the people themselves whether they shall admit a vodka-seller to their midst or not. Vodka-sellers get into the mirs by bribery and by paying a good share of the taxes. A vodka-seller will, perhaps, engage to pay 500 roubles of the mir's taxes, which, let us say, amounts to one-tenth of the whole. This being agreed to, the liquor-shop is opened, the moujiks [peasants] spend everything in drink, and the entire mir is demoralized. The vodka-seller takes 20 roubles out of every moujik's pocket, in return for which he pays 20 kopecks back in the guise of taxes. Now in Volosova we decided to keep our 20 roubles and pay our 20 kopecks taxes ourselves, and so at the end of the year we find ourselves 19 roubles and 80 kopecks in pocket." [1]

In Russia there are nearly a hundred holidays in the year (including Sundays), and it is the practice of the peasants to celebrate these days by visiting the vodka-shops and getting drunk. At times nearly all the inhabitants of a village, including the priests, will be found intoxicated. An interesting instance (the occasion being the dedication of a new church) is given by George Kennan in his graphic accounts of his Siberian experiences.[1]

---

[1] New York *World*, July 27, 1890.

The Jews have long been specially identified with the retail liquor business, in many places practically monopolizing it.

Some years ago the Good Templar Order was planted in Finland by Oscar Eklund of Sweden, but the authorities compelled its members to take the form of a public organization. In Russia proper some temperance sentiment has recently been developed by the example and counsels of Count Leo Tolstoi. Various total abstaining sects are found in different parts of the Empire.

Russian law prescribes severe punishment for drunkenness—imprisonment for not less than seven days or a fine of not less than 25 roubles. Intoxication cannot be pleaded in extenuation of crime. In St. Petersburg there are annually about 47,000 arrests for drunkenness.[2]

St. John, John P., fourth Presidential candidate of the Prohibition party; born at Brookville, Ind., Feb. 25, 1833. He was educated in a log schoolhouse, and after leaving school worked for several years as clerk in a store at $6 a month. When 19 he went to California, and in the next few years he led an adventurous life, making voyages to Mexico, South America and the Sandwich Islands and taking part in Indian wars in California and Oregon. Returning from the Pacific Coast in 1859 he lived for a while in Charleston, Ill. It was here that he was prosecuted, under the old Black laws, for assisting a fugitive colored boy. Mr. St. John had fed the lad. He pleaded guilty but was acquitted. He was admitted to the bar in 1862, and about the same time entered the Union army, in which he served as Captain, Major and Lieutenant-Colonel. Upon leaving the army in 1864 he went to Independence, Mo., where he practiced law for the next four years. In 1869 he changed his residence to Olathe, Kan., and he still lives there. His political career began in 1872, when he was chosen a member of the Kansas State Senate. He declined a re-election. The Republican party made him Governor of the State in 1878 and again (by an increased majority) in 1880. His second election is memorable because he was thoroughly committed to Prohibition, and because the Constitutional Amendment against the manufacture and sale of liquors was adopted at the same time. From his youth he had been an ardent opponent of the saloon; the home of his boyhood had been darkened by intemperance.

In 1882 he was once more a candidate for the Governorship, but the feeling against third terms and the antagonism of the liquor element caused his defeat. His administration of the office was especially distinguished by the completion of important public works and successful undertakings for advancing moral and material interests. A noteworthy incident was the cordial reception given and pecuniary help extended to about 75,000 destitute colored people who came into the State during that period. Governor St. John did not, however, apply any part of the State funds for their relief, but he organized a committee of citizens and made earnest and effective appeals. When the National Republican Convention of 1884 refused to express sympathy for the Prohibition cause he joined the Prohibition party. By it he was nominated for the Presidency, July 23, 1884. (See pp. 570–4.) The abuse and persecution to which he was subjected during and after the campaign of 1884 strengthened his attachment to the cause and increased the devotion of his followers. The charges made against him were shown to have had no foundation save in malignity. He continued his work, speaking in all parts of the country. He presided over the National Prohibition Convention of 1888.

Mr. St. John was for seven years President of the State Temperance Union of Kansas. He is regarded as one of the ablest and most popular of Prohibition advocates, particularly successful in platform oratory. He is a warm sympathizer with the Woman Suffrage, anti-monopoly and other radical movements.

Saloon.—The common name for the retail drink-shop, the equivalent of the

---

[1] See the *Century Magazine* for November, 1880.

[2] On the authority of Joseph Malins.

English "public house." The characteristics of the saloon as a place of resort and as a public institution are so well known and have been so frequently alluded to in this work (see especially Liquor Traffic) that it will be sufficient to notice here a few of the facts most prominently suggested by this subject.

The fundamental purposes of the typical saloon, indicated alike by its location, its equipment, its management and its associations, are to entice and ensnare, to absorb the money and time of the people without giving any useful, necessary or even harmless article in exchange. It thrives best where population is densest, but, unlike other business establishments, its prosperity does not depend upon the existence or cultivation of a self-respecting, thrifty and provident class of patrons: the disproportionate number of saloons, as compared with other places of trade, in the poor quarters of every city, illustrates this. Comparatively few individuals who have a decent reputation to maintain or a sensitiveness to protect are disposed or can afford to openly frequent the saloon at this day. Upon these general truths, and numberless allied truths of equal significance, rests the whole indictment against the drink traffic.

No typical saloon is complete unless it is peculiarly constructed and arranged with a view to facilitating violation of law and encouraging clandestine custom. Back doors and side doors, apertures and "family entrances," are designed solely for admitting and serving patrons on Sunday and during prohibited hours, or for accommodating individuals (like women and minors) who must be screened from the public gaze. It is a common thing also for the saloon to make merchandise of prostitution, gambling and all forms of vice, crime and wrong.

The saloon is singled out as a peculiarly dangerous and objectionable institution by all men of affairs. The fire insurance companies pronounce it a most unsafe "risk." Intense opposition is displayed by every person interested when it is proposed to place a saloon in the neighborhood of a church or school. The staunchest anti-Prohibitionists are quick to resent attempts to locate saloons near their residences or places of business.[1] Property-owners and real estate agents refuse to lease premises to retail liquor-sellers unless enormous rents are paid. A New York newspaper, reporting the efforts made by "persons representing some million dollars' worth of property" to prevent the opening of a dram-shop by one Gorger in their district of the city, says: "Gorger obtained a lease for the store at 81st street, agreeing to pay $6,000 per annum, though the present tenant, a real estate agent, is paying only $1,500. A store across the street, occupied by a druggist, rents for $3,800. An offer of $16,000 per year from a saloon-keeper for the premises was recently refused."[2]

Sandwich (Hawaiian) Islands.—Before the introduction of European civilization the Hawaiians prepared intoxicants from the narcotic root awa and the ti plant. After Capt. Cook's visit in 1778 these beverages gradually gave way to the white man's whiskey and rum. The consequences were terrible. When the missionaries arrived at the islands in 1820 the natives were addicted to the grossest intemperance, and their king, Kamehameha II., was a confirmed drunkard, spending whole days in debauchery. The example and influence of the missionaries were so potent that in October, 1829, the new king and his chiefs prohibited the manufacture and retailing of ardent spirits. This was resented by the few foreigners in Honolulu, and the dissolute companions of the young king encouraged him to grant licenses and so increase his revenues. The Regent and chiefs refused to issue any, but the law was relaxed. In 1831 a native temperance society was formed at Honolulu, pledging its members against drinking for pleasure, against dealing in liquors for gain and against treating friends or employes. In 1833 (in consequence of a petition signed by nearly 3,000 people) another Prohibitory law was passed and the traffic was suppressed everywhere except in Honolulu. In 1835 drunkenness was prohibited under penalty of a fine of $6, or one month at hard labor, or 24 lashes. Both these measures were poorly enforced. In 1838 the introduction of spirits into the kingdom was prohibited and a heavy duty was laid on wines. For a while drunkenness decreased and churches flourished. The larger towns, however, were under a sort of license system (allowing sales of wine, beer and native drinks), but a fine of $50 was imposed for every offense of selling without license. Capt. Laplace, commanding a French frigate, now appeared on the scene and at the point of the bayonet compelled the king to sign a treaty admitting, among other articles, French wines and brandy Excessive drinking was again the rule, and the king himself became a victim of the habit. About 1850 the selling and giving of intoxicants to natives were prohibited under penalty of $200 fine or two years' imprisonment at hard labor ; and in 1851 the sale of spirits was forbidden in all places except Honolulu. These measures, when enforced, were of great benefit to all, especially the natives. But in August, 1882, the two acts last mentioned were repealed, a license fee of $1,000 was established and saloons were introduced generally. Since then the consumption of liquor has been steadily on the increase. Custom House reports show that about 110,000 gallons are consumed annually, valued at about $850,000, representing an annual per capita expenditure of more than $10.50. Some temperance work has recently been done, under the direction of the missionaries and others, with occasional assistance from foreign visitors, like Mrs. Mary Clement Leavitt and Richard T. Booth. There is now (1890) an influential and active Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Honolulu.

---

[1] When the liquor men of Rhode Island were making preparations to repeal the Prohibitory Amendment several bankers of Providence signed their petitions. But after repeal had been accomplished these same bankers strenuously urged the Commissioners not to grant licenses for liquor-saloons in the vicinity of their banks. (See the *Voice*, Sept. 12, 1889.)

For a great variety of opinions from private citizens concerning the undesirability of having the saloon as a neighbor, see the *Voice* for Sept. 25, 1890, and Jan. 29, 1891.

[2] New York *Evening Post*, Jan. 21, 1891.

Thomas S. Southwick.
(Honolulu.)

Scientific Temperance Educational Laws.—These measures, providing for instruction in the public schools concerning the nature and effects of alcoholic liquors and narcotics, are of recent origin. The demand for such acts was first created by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, which established a special department in the interest of the movement, placing at its head Mrs. Mary H. Hunt of Massachusetts. Her intelligent and indefatigable labors have produced important results. The following is a list of States having such statutes:

Alabama (1885), California (1887), Colorado (1887), Connecticut (1886), Delaware (1887), Florida (1889), Illinois (1889), Iowa (1886), Kansas (1885), Louisiana (1888), Maine (1885), Maryland (1886), Massachusetts (1885), Michigan (1883 and 1886), Minnesota (1887), Missouri (1885), Montana (1890), Nebraska (1885), Nevada (1885), New Hampshire (1883), New York (1884), North Dakota (1890), Ohio (1888), Oregon (1885), Pennsylvania (1885), Rhode Island (1884), South Dakota (1890), Vermont (1882 and 1886), Virginia (by the State Board of Education, 1890), Washington (1890), West Virginia (1887), Wisconsin (1885).

In 1886 Congress, with the approval of the President, passed an act applying to the schools in the District of Columbia and Territories and all other schools controlled by the general Government. This was the first purely temperance measure enacted by Federal authority. For some years difficulty was experienced in obtaining satisfactory textbooks. Certain publishers of popular school works on physiology and hygiene failed to include in these works adequate information on the alcohol question, and in some cases beer and wine were approved or not condemned. But the efforts of Mrs. Hunt have been highly successful with publishers as well as with Legislatures. Her work has been wholly disinterested and philanthropic.

Scotland.—The organized temperance movement in Scotland dates from 1829. John Dunlop, J. P., of Greenock, Oct. 5, 1829, founded a temperance society at that place, four persons signing the following pledge:

> "We, the undersigned, hereby agree to abstain from all spirituous and fermented liquors for two years from this date, 5th October, 1829."

This Greenock society changed to an anti-spirits basis. Other societies were formed in this year at Maryhill, near Glasgow (Oct. 1), and at Glasgow (Nov. 12), through the efforts of Dunlop. The most important of the early organizations was the one begun at Dumfermline, Sept. 21, 1830, more than 150 persons subscribing to a thoroughly radical pledge within a few days. On Sept. 4, 1838, a general Convention was held in Glasgow, 41 delegates being present from 30 societies, and the Scottish Temperance Union was begun, with Dunlop as President. The Scottish Temperance League was started at Falkirk, Nov. 5, 1844. In 1845 there were 74 societies in Scotland with a total membership of 40,000 in a population of 600,000; in 1850 250 societies with a membership of 90,000. The Scottish Permissive Bill and Temperance Association, with legislative and other objects similar to those of the United Kingdom Alliance, was founded Oct. 1, 1858.

Though the Scots have been regarded as hard drinkers from early times the cause has, on the whole, made more substantial and gratifying progress among them than among the English or Irish. The facts that follow are given on the authority of Mr. Robert Mackay, Secretary of the Scottish Permissive Bill and Temperance Association.

At the end of 1889 the Good Templar Order had a membership of 60,000, and there were numerous other temperance organizations, strong in numbers and influence. The religious denominations, with the Free Church in the van, were generally aggressive. All the temperance workers were united for the great object of securing the enactment by the Imperial Parliament of the Scotland Direct Veto (Local Option) bill which has been pressed for several years by Peter M'Lagan, M.P. Plebiscites on the question of the Direct Veto, which have been taken in the leading towns, leave no doubt that the country is overwhelmingly for this policy and, presumably, for local Prohibition; by these plebiscites the people have, by a vote of twelve to one, expressed a desire to be clothed with Prohibitory powers. Of the 72 Scottish Members of Parliament in 1889, 47 were for Mr. M'Lagan's bill, 14 were for some form of popular regulation, and only 11 were distinctly against suppressing the drink traffic. The bill had reached second reading in the House of Commons, a stage farther than any general Local Option measure had been advanced. Introduction of the system has been prevented only by the obstructive tactics of English members and the interference of the Irish question. Scotland has had full Sunday-closing (sales to bona fide travellers being permitted, however) since 1853—longer than any other country within the United Kingdom. In 1889 there were 127 distilleries, producing 18,721,374 gallons of spirits (of which 5,769,101 gallons were retained in Scotland for beverage purposes), and the quantity of malt liquors retained for home consumption was 1,275,068 barrels (each barrel containing 36 gallons). The per capita consumption of foreign spirits and wines was 1.286 gallon; of beer, 26.892 gallons; per capita consumption of all liquors on the basis of proof spirits, 3.70 gallons. There were 16,592 ordinary retail liquor licenses in force. The consequences of the licensed liquor business are no less appalling in Scotland than elsewhere.

Seventh-Day Adventists.—Resolutions of the General Conference, held in Minneapolis, Minn., Oct. 23, 1888:

"*Whereas*, We recognize temperance as one of the Christian graces; therefore

"RESOLVED, That we heartily indorse the principles of the American Health and Temperance Association, in protesting against the manufacture and sale of all spirituous and malt liquors, and in discarding the use of tea, coffee, opium and tobacco, and that we urge upon all people the importance of these principles.

"RESOLVED, That while we pledge ourselves to labor earnestly and zealously for the Prohibition of the liquor traffic, we hereby utter an earnest protest against connecting with the temperance movement any legislation which discriminates in favor of any religious class or institution, or which tends to the infringement of anybody's religious liberty; and that we cannot sustain or encourage any temperance party or any other organization which indorses or favors such legislation."

Sewall, Thomas. — Born in Augusta, Me., April 16, 1786; died in Washington, D.C., April 10, 1845. He took his medical degree at Harvard in 1812. In 1827 he was made professor in the Medical Department of Columbian University, Washington, D. C. He wrote and lectured extensively on the scientific phases of temperance, and prepared a series of charts, which have since been widely used by lecturers and others, illustrating the condition of the human stomach under the influence of alcohol. Dr. Sewall reached the conclusion that "Alcohol is a poison, forever at war with man's nature; and in all its forms and degrees of strength produces irritation of the stomach which is liable to result in inflammation, ulceration and mortification; a thickening and induration of its coats, and finally schirrhus, cancer and other organic affections. It may be asserted with confidence that no one who indulges habitually in the use of alcoholic drinks, whether in the form of wine or more ardent spirits, possesses a healthy stomach."

Sherry.—See Vinous Liquors.

Sin Per Se.—The phrase "sin *per se*" (from the Latin *per*, in or by, and *se*, itself) is one originating from the theological controversies of the early Christian church. It is used to designate those actions which are, from their inherent nature, regarded as sinful. It is evident that there are many acts which are not in themselves sinful, but which, because of the consequences they involve, under certain circumstances become sinful. To defraud another, for instance, is a sin not because of its harmfulness but because of the inherent character of the act. Stealing a dime from a rich employer might involve little or nothing of injury to him, yet it would be as certainly a sin as the theft of a thousand dollars. The moral character of the action would be the same in each case, irrespective of its harmfulness. On the other hand, driving a horse rapidly is not a sin because of the moral nature of the act itself, but driving a horse rapidly under such circumstances as to endanger life or limb is a sin because of the injury it causes or may cause. To ask whether the drinking a glass of liquor is a sin *per se* is simply to ask whether the act is inherently immoral, or immoral because of the injury it involves either to the one drinking or to others. If the act were harmless, not only in its direct effects but in its indirect influence, would it be a sin? Unquestionably not. Moreover, it might be harmful and yet, if the one drinking were ignorant of that fact, the act still would not be a *sin* unless the ignorance were due to wilful blindness. A sin *per se* presupposes an act of conscious disloyalty to one's sense of right. Drinking liquor may involve just that, but it may not.

A similar distinction is made in law between offenses *malum in se* (evil in themselves) and offenses *malum prohibitum* (evil because prohibited). The first class embraces acts "naturally evil" (Bouvier), such as theft, arson, murder, and the second class embraces acts not inherently evil, but which are likely to involve injury, such as fast driving, building frame houses within the fire limits, establishing a slaughter-house in a residence district. The evil in the former case inheres in the act itself, apart from the consequences; in the latter case the evil lies in the possible or probable consequences.

The question whether Prohibition is based upon the doctrine that it is a sin *per se* to drink liquor, is one of more than mere metaphysical importance. There are several denominations, notably the Roman Catholic Church, whose theology is repugnant to such a doctrine, which, it is felt, would involve the ancient Manichæan heresy, in which all matter was considered as originating with the powers of darkness, and all attempt to derive pleasure from material things was forbidden as sinful. That Prohibition is not based upon any such doctrine should appear from the fact that no Prohibitory law ever framed or seriously proposed provided for the prohibition of liquor as a medicine, or indeed prohibited the *use* of liquor in any form. The prohibition applies to the barter and sale, as something involving disastrous public consequences. If Prohibition were based upon the Manichæan heresy, it would apply to the use of liquor in all forms and under all circumstances. The fact that the distinction between the ordinary beverage use and the use as a medicine is carefully made, indicates that it is the *harmfulness* of drinking that is guarded against. The law that forbids the traffic in spoiled meat or "bob-veal" does not imply that it is a sin *per se* to eat tainted meat or "bob-veal." So the law of Prohibition does not imply the doctrine of sin *per se*. While this distinction has not, perhaps, always been kept clear in the minds of some of the advocates of Prohibition, yet on the whole the argument in its behalf is that the sale of liquor is an injury to the common weal, and therefore, because of its *consequences*, it ought to be forbidden.

E. J. Wheeler.

Smith, Gerrit.—Born in Utica, N. Y., March 6, 1797; died in New York City, Dec. 28, 1874. He was a pioneer Abolitionist, a philanthropist and a man of wealth, owner of vast tracts of land in northern and central New York, and once a partner with John Jacob Astor in the fur trade. In 1848 he refused to support the Free Soil ticket and was himself nominated by the extreme Abolitionists for President. He was elected to Congress in 1852, but resigned at the close of the first session. He was a most radical opponent of the liquor traffic as well as of slavery, and insisted that neither of these evils could rightfully be legalized, because both were inherently and necessarily outlaws. He was also greatly interested in the question of Woman Suffrage, and in promoting the property rights of married women. In 1869 he went to Chicago to help form the Prohibition party, but not agreeing with its plans and methods he did not give the national organization a very hearty support, although in New York he took considerable interest in the Anti-Dramshop party.

Smith, Green Clay, second Prohibition Presidential candidate; born in Richmond, Ky., July 2, 1832. His father, John Speed Smith, was an aide-de-camp to Gen. William Henry Harrison in the War of 1812, and was a Member of Congress from Kentucky. His mother was the daughter of Gen. Green Clay and the sister of Cassius M. Clay. As a boy he served with credit in the Mexican War. After he was mustered out of the army he graduated at Transylvania University, studied law and commenced the practice of his profession with his father. In 1856 he married and settled in Covington, Ky. Before the Civil War he was a Democrat. He predicted that the election of Lincoln would result in war. Secession sentiment ran high in Covington when Fort Sumter was fired on. Mr. Smith with six other Unionists called a meeting which to their surprise was largely attended. Without knowing the sentiment of the audience he boldly denounced secession. A few ran out in disgust, but the speaker carried most of the audience with him. He enlisted in the Union Army as a private, and was rapidly promoted to the ranks of Major, Colonel and Brigadier-General. In 1863 he was elected to Congress. He was a warm friend of Lincoln's and heartily supported the Administration. He was appointed by President Johnson Governor of Montana. Returning to Kentucky, he entered the Baptist ministry. He has been presiding officer of the General Association of his church in Kentucky for nine consecutive years. He has represented the Sons of Temperance as Grand Worthy Patriarch, and the Good Templars as Worthy Chief Templar. In 1876 he was nominated for President of the United States by the Prohibition party, and received 9,737 votes.

Social Purity.—The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union was not many years in perceiving that intemperance and impurity are iniquity's Siamese Twins, that malt liquors and wine have special power to tarnish the sacred springs of being, that every house of ill-repute is a secret saloon and nearly every inmate an inebriate. White-Ribboners became painfully conscious that unnatural and unspeakable crimes against the physically weaker sex make our daily papers read like a modern edition of Fox's "Martyrs," and that a madness not excelled if indeed equalled in the worst days of Rome seems to possess the inflamed natures of men let loose from the two hundred thousand saloons of the nation upon the weak and unarmed women whose bewildering danger it is to have attracted the savage glances of these men, or to be bound to them by the sacred tie of wife or mother in bondage worse than that which lashes the living to the dead. White-Ribboners also began to study the laws and discovered that to steal a cow was a crime punished more severely than the stealing of a woman's honor. In many of the States the responsibility for a dual moral defalcation was to be equally shared by a girl of ten years old, no matter how much greater might be the age of her assailant, while penalties were found to be light and conviction hard to secure.

Considerations like these had long been stirring the conscience of the W. C. T. U. and sporadic efforts had been made to enter practically upon the work of promoting social purity, but not until the Philadelphia W. C. T. U. Convention in 1885 was the reform begun nationally. Three months before, William T. Stead's mighty disclosures had aroused the English-speaking race to the unprotected condition of women and girls; and as a consequence the British Parliament had raised the age of protection to 16 years, and had otherwise greatly increased the safeguards of the physically weaker sex. Under the impetus of this new movement the White Cross pledge for men had been successfully introduced into this country, and the writer, in her annual address at Philadelphia, made a plea for the organization of a national movement for the protection of women. The Department was organized, and the writer was placed at its head. She at once prepared a petition for the protection of women and went to Mr. Terence V. Powderly, chief of the Knights of Labor, and secured his agreement to send out 92,000 copies to his Local Assemblies; and during that year, by every practicable means, the same petition was circulated throughout the United States. In 1888 it was presented to Congress by Senator Blair and the desired bill, raising the age of consent to 16 years, was passed.

There is hardly a State or Territory in which there has not been a notable improvement in the laws within five years, and humanly speaking, the W. C. T. U. was the instrument employed. A literature has been wrought out, for parents, preachers, teachers, young people; pledges have been prepared, and everything needed to spread the propaganda is furnished by the Woman's Temperance Publication Association. (Chicago).

Industrial homes for women are being founded by State appropriations; protective agencies in the large cities to cooperate with friendless women in their efforts to secure such rights as they have under the law; missions of hope and help for degraded women; lodging houses and reading rooms; police matrons in all police stations—all these, and many methods more, attest the intelligent zeal of White-Ribboners for the betterment of their own sex. Laws giving to the mother the equal custody of her children, making property and marriage laws more just between husband and wife, clothing women with the ballot's protection and power, and outlawing the liquor traffic are all a part of this great work, for there is not one among the forty departments provided for in the plan of the National W. C. T. U. that does not close like the fingers of the hand upon that core and center of the world's manifold curse—the social evil.

FRANCES E. WILLARD.

Sons of Temperance.—The rise and progress of the Washingtonian movement were phenomenal. Its enthusiasm was inspiring, and the principles and blessings of total abstinence were spread throughout the land. In connection with it came the organization of the Sons of Temperance in New York City, Sept. 29, 1842. This association at once assumed a prominent place among the fraternal and benevolent organizations, incorporating among its principles a life of abstinence. Its founders had three distinct objects in view: "To shield themselves from the evils of intemperance, to afford mutual assistance in case of sickness and to elevate their character as men." Their plan of organization embraced three distinct branches—the Subordinate (or local) Division, the Grand Division (confining its work to the Province or State) and the National Division (whose jurisdiction is North America). The Subordinate Division meets weekly and is the life and strength of the Order. The Grand Division holds quarterly or semi-annual sessions, and supervises the work in State or Province. The National Division meets annually, and in it is vested the supreme power. The grand purpose is to reclaim the inebriate, rescue the moderate drinker and save the youth from the power of the drink habit. The Order has no privileged classes; it enrolls all ranks in society. Women have every right and privilege accorded to any member, and are eligible to every office in the gift of the Order. The body recognizes no distinction on account of sex, color, wealth or former condition.

The Order is made attractive by impressive ceremonies, and a solemn obligation is taken to live a life of sobriety, purity and benevolence. While classed among the "secret" temperance societies it is destitute, in its mystic features, of sign, grip and degree. The ritual service is brief, including admonitions from the word of God, elevating moral precepts and the melody of music. Its membership is sincere and devoted to the work of the Order, in pursuance of its fundamental principles of "Love, Purity and Fidelity." It is a voluntary association, with just and explicit laws, and yet without the power of enforcing an unwilling obedience. It not only enjoins total abstinence as a cardinal idea but takes all legitimate and honorable means to suppress and prohibit the manufacture of and the traffic in intoxicating drinks, and it will never rest satisfied until the annihilation of the drink traffic is secured. The Mutual Relief Society, in connection with the Order, is a public charity conducted as a fraternal business enterprise. It is a valuable auxiliary in propagation work, and gives strength and permanency to Subordinate Divisions. It is well officered, prompt and economical, meriting and receiving a very generous support from the Order in all its branches. In North America the Sons of Temperance have 1,600 Subordinate Divisions, with a membership exceeding 85,000. The National Division is the fountain-head and has granted charters for the N. D. of Great Britain and Ireland, the N. D. of Australasia and the N. D. of Victoria and South Australia, in each of which countries there is a large and influential membership. The Sons of Temperance cordially extend the hand of fellowship to all temperance organizations, and to all champions of the cause in their mission to destroy the power of the drink habit and traffic.

B. R. JEWELL.
(Most Worthy Secretary.)

The following is a list of the men who have held the position of Most Worthy Patriarch since the beginning of the Order: 1844–6, Daniel H. Sands; 1846–8, Philip S. White; 1848–50, Samuel F. Cary; 1850–2, John W. Oliver; 1852–4, John B. O'Neal; 1854–6, Samuel L. Tilley; 1856–8, M. D. McHenry; 1858–60, B. D. Townsend; 1860–2, S. L. Condict; 1862–4, S. L. Carleton; 1864–6, J. J. Bradford; 1866–8, John N. Stearns; 1868–70, Robert M. Foust; 1870–2, S. B. Ransom; 1872–4, O. D. Wetmore; 1874–6, F. M. Bradley; 1876–8, Louis Wagner; 1878–80, George W. Ross; 1880–2, Evan J. Morris; 1882–4, Benjamin R. Jewell; 1884–6, B. F. Dennisson; 1886–8, R. Alder Temple; 1888–90, Edward Crummey.

South America.—The intelligent people of those South American Republics that lie in the torrid regions are compelled by natural conditions to recognize the virtue of temperance. In their warm climate excessive drinking is swiftly fatal. But in the temperate parts of the continent, especially the Argentine Republic and Chili, much greater carelessness is shown. On the other hand some of the tropical countries are by no means exempt from the drink curse, and the detestable domestic intoxicants work great havoc among the natives and in the seaport towns. Throughout South America radical anti-liquor legislation seems to be practically unknown.

The particulars for various nations that follow are partly from such statistical authorities as the "Statesman's Year-Book" and the United States Consular reports, and partly from information specially obtained for this work from American Ministers in South America and South American Ministers in the United States.

The *Argentine Republic* (population in 1887, about 3,900,000) has no special legislative policy against the liquor traffic, but the proprietors of liquor establishments, like all other persons engaged in trade, must pay license fees. These fees range from $125 to $1,250 a year. The city of Buenos Ayres has a police ordinance punishing the inebriate with a heavy fine, which is doubled on second offense. In 1885 the Provinces of Mendoza, Cordoba and San Juan yielded 3,890,000 gallons of wine, and the production of rum reached 1,540,000 gallons. In 1887 the total value of imported goods was $117,352,125; value of imported liquors, $15,488,437. About 30,000,000 gallons of wine were imported, valued at about $12,000,000. The Argentines have a special fondness for the Bordeaux wines of France. The beer and other light drinks imported in 1887 had a value of about $1,100,000; distilled spirits of various kinds, about $2,400,000.

Brazil (population in 1888, 14,000,000) levies comparatively high duties on liquors, and the license fees for vendors are also relatively high. The wine-producing industry is in its infancy, but is advancing; and artificial wines are fabricated on a considerable scale. The brewing business is rapidly developing; in Rio Janeiro there were in 1889 42 breweries and agencies for provincial breweries. In 1885–6 6,540,960 gallons of wine were imported through the Rio Janeiro custom-house, most of it coming from Portugal.

British Guiana (population in 1887, 277,038) supplies other countries with large quantities of rum. Much of the so-called Jamaica rum comes from British Guiana. Total exports of rum in 1885, 28,353 puncheons, valued at $1,004,562.

In *Chili* (population in 1885, 2,527,320) the liquor traffic is perfectly free and the taxes on sellers are low. The annual production of wine is about 24,000,000 gallons, most of which is consumed at home. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are invested in breweries (owned by Germans), and the beer output is rapidly increasing. Value of imports of wines, liquors and beer in 1887, 1,079,905 pesos. (The Chilian peso is nominally equal to a dollar, but its commercial value is a little less.)

The *United States of Colombia* (estimated population in 1881, 3,878,600) permits the retail liquor business to stand on the same footing with other trades, no attempt being made to regulate it. The manufacture is a Government monopoly, the right to produce liquors being sold to the highest bidders. In 1890 there were two breweries, one at Bogota and one at Medellin, but their product was small and of poor quality. Large quantities of vile liquors of the varieties known as chica and aguardiente are made and consumed, but the United States Minister informs us that there are no official figures. The tariff on imported liquors is high.

Paraguay (estimated population in 1888, 270,000) distills caña, or rum, from the sugar-cane. The mode of manufacture is rude and the spirit is horribly impure, but is in considerable request among the common people. Value of imported wines, liquors, etc., in 1886, $235,855.53.

In *Peru* (population in 1876, 2,621,844) the Government regards the manufacture of liquor as an important industry and does not tax it. But the consumption is taxed and imported liquors pay duty. The native distilled intoxicants are chica (from the mixed juices of Indian corn, apples and grapes) and rum (from the sugar-cane). These articles are both nasty and cheap: an ordinary wine-bottle of rum costs only about 13 cents. Brandy is made from the grape. Wine is abundant, the annual yield averaging about 400,000 barrels, valued at $2,640,000 United States money. The Peruvian wines are strong in alcohol. The consumption tax is 1 to 10 cents per liter (quart), and it is collected from the publicans by private individuals, to whom the privilege is auctioned. In the district of Lima the general Government's revenue in 1889 from this source was about $75,000, and the municipal Government had an additional revenue of about $94,000. Liquor sellers also have to pay license fees. There are no temperance societies.

Uraguay (population in 1886, 596,463) does not in any way impose severer restrictions upon the drink traffic than upon other branches of trade. In the last few years extensive vineyards have been planted. The imports of liquors of all kinds in 1886 were valued in the neighborhood of $4,000,000.

Venezuela in 1884 had a population (estimated) of 2,121,988. Most of the liquors consumed in this country are French wines and brandies of execrable quality. Concerning the Venezuelans Mr. W. S. Bird, United States Consul at La Guayra, wrote in 1885: "They are remarkably free from drunkenness and singularly exempt from crime."

South Carolina.—See Index.

South Dakota.—The steps leading to the enactment of Prohibition in South Dakota are described on p. 126. The statute (approved March 1, 1890) is very thorough in its provisions. The penalty for manufacturing, selling or keeping for sale any liquor for beverage purposes in violation of law is a fine of $100 to $500 and imprisonment in the County Jail 60 days to six months for the first offense, and one year's confinement in the State Prison for any subsequent offense. But any registered pharmacist may sell for medical, mechanical, sacramental and scientific purposes, upon procuring a permit (good for one year) from the County Judge, the granting or refusing of such a permit being subject to popular petition and judicial discretion, and various conditions similar to those laid down in the Kansas law (pp. 299-300); and druggists' sales are regulated by the strictest provisions, violators to suffer the penalties above stated. If any person signing a druggist's petition for a permit knows that the applicant is in the habit of becoming intoxicated, or is not in good faith engaged in the pharmacy business, he shall be punished by a fine of $50 to $100. A County Judge knowingly granting a permit to such an applicant must pay a fine of $500 to $1,000; any Sheriff, Deputy Sheriff, State's Attorney, Mayor, Constable, Marshal, police officer or other officer wilfully failing to perform duties imposed by the act shall be fined $100 to $500, and be imprisoned in the County Jail 60 days to six months, and forfeit his office. The provisions of the Kansas and North Dakota legislation relating to injunction and nuisance, search and seizure, civil damage and other radical proceedings are carefully followed. The statute is published in pamphlet form (25 pp.).

[For other South Dakota particulars, see the Index.]

Spain.—The exceptional temperance of the Spanish nation has been variously attributed to the instinctive abstemiousness of the Latin races and the tendency of a semi-tropical climate, but is to a large degree undoubtedly due to the influence of the seven centuries of Arabian supremacy, when the manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages were restricted by severe legal penalties and the at least external observance of temperate habits became a characteristic of a liberal education. The manifold vices of the Castilian nobles in the time of Philip II. did not include the vice of drunkenness, and in the national character-sketches of Cervantes and Lope de Vega the toper is almost invariably depicted as a low-bred ruffian. *Boracho* (drunkard) became a synonyme of everything vulgar and brutish, while temperance, if not abstinence, was too generally practiced by every person of common sense to be regarded as a special virtue. The expulsion of the Moors marked the beginning of a gradual change in the habits of the nation, but Spain still ranks as one of the most temperate countries of modern Europe, and the product of the enormous vineyard area is largely absorbed by the export trade and the manufacture of raisins.

FELIX L. OSWALD.

The annual production of wine in Spain (or what passes for wine) is in the neighborhood of 500,000,000 United States gallons. A very large quantity of this so-called wine is made from cheap German spirits, with the infusion of some grape-must and certain flavoring and other chemical substances. The returns of spirits imported into Spain for the years 1873–85 are impressive. In 1873 the total value of imported spirits was $1,945,247 ; in 1885, $10,666,531. The exports of "wines" increased immensely in the same period:—exports in 1873, 69,733,126 United States gallons, valued at $34,856,349 ; in 1885, 189,767,837 United States gallons, valued at $60,084,714.[1] The most famous Spanish wine is sherry, from the town of Jerez. J. A. Hall, United States Consular Agent at Jerez, made a report in 1887 on the unscrupulous adulterations of the sherry-makers. He said that they not only fortify extensively, but instead of fortifying with a superior alcohol use "Berlin spirits, produced principally from potatoes and laden with deadly amylic alcohol." [2] But even the official figures show a great decline in the amount of Spanish sherry produced. In 1873 there were 13,210,710 United States gallons exported; in 1889, 2,631,899 United States gallons. The phylloxera is responsible for this decrease. The common and Catalonian wines constitute about 95 per cent. of the entire product, and there is a great demand for them in France, where they are converted into high-priced beverages.

Spirits and **Spirituous Liquors** are all those alcoholic fluids that are prepared by distillation, or by compounding or treating distilled products for the fabrication of beverages stronger than wines;[3] including (1) the simple or "commercial" alcohols that are used for mechanical, scientific, medicinal and similar purposes, or for the "doctoring" of drinks; (2) the common distilled beverages, like whiskey, brandy, rum and gin, which are distinguished from ordinary spirits by a more acceptable taste; and (3) the complex articles, known as liqueurs and cordials, which are obtained by combinations of spirits with aromatic and like substances. Dr. Benjamin W. Richardson declares that it is impossible by any process of fermentation to produce a liquor of above 17 per cent. alcoholic strength; and most natural ferments are much weaker, some containing only 2 per cent. The method of manufacturing original spirits is outlined under DISTILLATION and RECTIFICATION.

To the three classes of spirits and spirituous liquors indicated above a fourth may be added, embracing the distilled drinks of different nations which are characteristic of localities but are little known to American commerce.

COMMERCIAL SPIRITS.

Under this name are classed non-beverage spirits of all degrees of strength and all grades of purity. When grain or fruit, etc., is distilled, the immediate product is a mixture of water, ethylic alcohol (C_2H_6O) and other and more poisonous alcohols (propylic [C_3H_8O], butylic [$C_4H_{10}O$], amylic [$C_5H_{12}O$], etc.). This immediate product is subjected to different methods of treatment, according to the purpose in view. If the purpose is to make of it a marketable beverage liquor of superior quality, it is barreled and stored in the warehouse for two or three years, when through the operation of natural chemical changes the impurer elements disappear; and the work of nature is supplemented by arts that give the liquor a distinctive flavor and color. If the purpose is simply to obtain alcoholic spirits without regard to beverage qualities, strength or purity, the crude article is accepted and utilized in its existing form; if a strong and pure spirit is desired it is carefully redistilled at a temperature low enough to vaporize ethylic alcohol, but not high enough to vaporize water or the above-mentioned corruptions. Thus commercial spirits are alcohols proper; spirituous liquors, on the other hand, are intoxicating distilled drinks proper.

---

[1] United States Consular reports, vol. 24, pp. 80–3.

[2] Ibid, vol. 28, pp. 40–1.

[3] Spirits are also used on a great scale for "fortifying" wines.

The use of commercial spirits is by no means confined to the arts, manufactures and similar legimate fields. It is true that in their original form they are not consumed as beverages to any important extent; the average toper would prefer a dram of the meanest and deadliest whiskey to a potion of the purest refined alcohol. But alcohol being the basis of all inebriating drinks, commercial spirits are available for the fabrication of special liquors of all kinds. In practice by far the largest part of distilled beverages is produced by adding various coloring, flavoring and other substances to common spirits; all varieties and brands of wines may be and are concocted from commercial spirits.[1]

Official returns shows that, taking into account all kinds of spirits, both commercial and beverage, 4.27 gallons are now produced in the United States from one bushel of grain, and that 0.754 gallon of rum is produced from one gallon of molasses.[2]

To distinguish with technical accuracy between the different kinds of commercial spirits would necessitate very elaborate explanations. For Federal revenue purposes there is one classification, the drug trade has another, and the ordinary alcohol-dealers have their own peculiar varieties. Terms and names are frequently used interchangeably or with but slight distinctions. The fundamental point is this: all commercial spirits are classed according to their *alcoholic strength* and *purity*, and no other properties are recognized. "Proof spirit" (having an alcoholic strength in the United States of 50 per cent.) is the basis from which strength is determined for revenue purposes. Avoiding technical classifications which are made only for trade convenience, we give below a table, prepared by Alonzo Robbins, showing the actual alcoholic strength of certain strictly-classified commercial alcohols, the percentages being obtained by averaging the results of analyses of spirits sold in the market under the specified names:[3]

COMMERCIAL ALCOHOLS.	PER CENT. BY VOLUME.	PER CENT. BY WEIGHT.	SPECIFIC GRAVITY.
1 Absolute Alcohol.	99.60	99.19	.7962
2 Extra Colo'ne Spt	94.75	92.03	.8170
3 Cologne Spirit ...	93.75	91.02	.8199
4 95 per ct. Alcohol.	93.25	90.19	.8223
5 Proof Spirit[1]	52.00	44.50	.9303
6 Neutral Swt Spt..	41.50	44.80	.9494

[1] This "proof spirit" embraces one part (by weight) of "95 per cent. alcohol" and one part of water; or by a more common formula, 50 parts of alcohol and 50 parts of water.

The individual commercial spirits as known to trade are briefly noticed below.

Alcohol, generally speaking, is any commercial spirit; and this is the name by which all such spirits are known and retailed to the public at large. But in the drug trade it is applied to only two officinal spirits, one called "alcohol," having a strength of 91 per cent. by weight, and the other, called "diluted alcohol," a strength of 45 per cent. by weight. The "diluted alcohol" of the Pharmacopœia, it will be noticed, is nearly equivalent in strength to ordinary spirits; but it is obtained by diluting strong and pure alcohol with water.[4] *Ninety-five per cent. alcohol* is a name not so much in use now as it was formerly; it is a general designation for the regular high-grade alcohol of commerce. In the table above its percentage of strength is given as 93.25 by volume and 90.19 by weight. The revisers (1880) of the United States Pharmacopœia state that the present officinal 91 per cent. alcohol corresponds to the so-called "95 per cent. alcohol."

Absolute alcohol, theoretically, is perfectly pure alcohol. But practically the commercial article known as "absolute" contains some water, the percentage varying from 5 or 6 to less than 1, according to the carefulness exercised in preparing and preserving it. Extraordinary caution is required to obtain absolute (or even nearly absolute) alcohol and to keep it free from water. The strongest and purest spirit that can be produced by repeated distillations contains only about 91 per cent. of alcohol, unless the process is carried on very delicately in a perfect vacuum. To further purify the spirit it must be treated with

---

[1] As is stated on p. 19 the quantity of spirits used in the United States in the arts and manufactures, and for all other purposes than beverage consumption, has been estimated by a large firm of alcohol-dealers as only 10 per cent. of the entire distilled product. Since p. 19 was electrotyped, an official estimate has been published by the Census Bureau in a "preliminary report" (Census Bulletin No 22, Jan. 20, 1891). Returns were obtained by the Census authorities from wholesale druggists and manufacturers, eleemosynary institutions (dispensatories, homes, asylums and others of like nature) and retail apothecaries; and they show that the total consumption of distilled spirits "in the arts, manufactures and medicine during the year ending Dec. 31, 1889," was 10,976,842. This quantity includes, besides various kinds of commercial spirits, 2,702,650 proof gallons of whiskey, brandy, rum and gin. It is well known that much whiskey, brandy, rum and gin is sold by apothecaries for other than medicinal purposes—in fact for beverage purposes pure and simple; therefore the 10,976.842 proof gallons reported by the Census Bureau includes an element—possibly a considerable element—of spirits consumed for beverage. But if it is assumed that this element will be balanced by quantities consumed for art, manufacturing and similar purposes not reported to the Census Bureau, and consequently that the 10,976,842 gallons represents the exact consumption for other than beverage purposes, we find that the aggregate quantity so consumed was only 13 per cent. of the entire number of proof gallons (85,043,336) withdrawn for consumption during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890. (It should be borne in mind that this 13 per cent. is the *maximum* percentage, as determined by official investigation; it is probable that the actual percentage is noticeably smaller.)

The Census Bureau's figures are of further interest from the fact that they show the volumes of business in alcohol and distilled liquors done, respectively, by wholesale druggists and manufacturers, eleemosynary institutions and retail apothecaries, as follows:

SPIRITS AND DISTILLED LIQUORS.	WHOLESALE DRUGGISTS AND MANUFACTURERS.	ELEEMOSYNARY INSTITUTIONS.	RETAIL APOTHECARIES
	Proof Galls.	*Proof Galls.*	*Proof Galls.*
Alcohol....	5,425,791	30,092	1,289,269
Col. Spirits.	1,334.033	4,374	114.641
High Wines	54,737	883	20,372
Whiskey. ..	879,282	59,222	1.085,396
Brandy.....	100.482	6,599	159,793
Rum.	87.378	841	101,362
Gin	84,937	779	136,579
Totals....	7.966,640	102,790	2.907,412

[2] Internal Revenue report for 1890, p. 58.

[3] United States Dispensatory, 1887.

[4] The United States Dispensatory (edition of 1887) sounds this warning to druggists, and incidentally to the drinking public:

"The apothecary should never substitute the commercial proof spirit for diluted alcohol, even though it be of the same strength, on account of the impurities in the former."

caustic lime or other substances that will absorb the water, and be filtered through charcoal, etc. By great painstaking an alcohol can be produced in which the quantity of water will be almost infinitesimal—much less than 1 per cent It must be carefully sealed, for its affinity for water is so strong that it will be quickly weakened from the absorption of moisture if the atmosphere has access to it.

Cologne spirit has a strength of from 90 to 95 and is an article supposed to be especially free from all impurities. *Extra cologne spirit* is of somewhat higher grade.

French spirits is one of the commercial names for high-grade alcohol of about the same quality as cologne spirits; dealers in this country recognize practically no difference between these articles.

High proof spirit is a term applicable to any spirit with an alcoholic percentage greater than that of proof spirit. (See *proof spirit*, below.)

High wines is the distiller's name for the product of the second distillation in the manufacture of any spirit from a fermented infusion, the spirit resulting from the first distillation being called "low wines."

Low proof spirits are spirits of any sort which upon test disclose an alcoholic strength below that of proof spirit. (See *proof spirit.*)

Low wines is a name given to the product of the first distillation of an alcoholic ferment.

Neutral spirits and *neutral sweet spirits* are names used without much discrimination; they may imply a commercial alcohol of about 45 per cent. strength, but alcohols of higher percentages are also denoted and articles of about the grade of cologne spirit are often indicated by these names as used by American dealers.

Plain spirit is the ordinary product of simple distillation—the crudest product of the still. It is the article used in enormous quantities as the principal basis of common gin, British brandy, wines and other counterfeited beverages of all kinds. It is too offensive to be tolerated by the palate unless disguised, and, being frequently below proof, it is even more corrupt than common proof spirit.

Proof spirit is an arbitrary name adopted by the Government to indicate the standard from which the strengths of all distilled products are measured for revenue purposes. In the United States spirits are said to be proof when one-half the volume is alcohol at a temperature of 60° F. and of a specific gravity of 0.7939; the parts of water are nominally 50, but actually 53.71, owing to the contraction of the liquids when mixed. The proof spirit of the British Excise system is 49.3 per cent. strong by weight, or 57.09 per cent. by volume. But the name "proof spirit" indicates a mere standard, and articles sold under this name may vary several degrees above and below actual proof. The word "proof" refers exclusively to strength, implying nothing whatever as to purity. The most infamous rum or whiskey may answer the "proof" test as satisfactorily as an article reduced by water-dilution from absolute alcohol. The percentage of water to be added to or taken from a given spirit in order to bring it to proof indicates the number of degrees that that spirit is "above proof" or "below proof." In Great Britain the special terms, *second proof spirit*, *third proof spirit* and *fourth proof spirit*, are applied to spirits 60, 70 and 80 per cent. strong, respectively.

Pure spirits is a name for the purest and strongest products of ordinary distillation.

Rectified spirit is a high-grade officinal alcohol of the British Pharmacopœia, about 6 per cent. weaker than the United States 91 per cent. officinal. In a non-technical sense "rectified spirit" is any alcohol that has been redistilled.

Spiritus tenuior, one of the two officinals of the British Pharmacopœia, is identical in strength with the British proof spirit.

Spirit of wine (*spiritus vini*) is a term formerly employed comprehensively to designate alcohol, because that article was originally extracted from wine; now applied in a general way to the higher-grade alcohols and especially to the common high-grade commercial spirits ranging in alcoholic strength from 89 to 95 per cent.

Wood spirit or *methyl alcohol* is distilled from wood, and is entirely distinct from all the spirits (ethylic) above considered. Its chemical formula is $C H_4O$, that of ethylic alcohol being $C_2 H_6 O$. It is sometimes inaccurately called naphtha (true naphtha being distilled from petroleum). Wood spirit is never used as a beverage. *Methylated* spirit is ethylic spirit mixed with about one-ninth its volume of wood spirit, and this preparation is employed in various arts and manufactures.

THE COMMON DISTILLED BEVERAGES.

These are of four principal varieties: whiskey, brandy, rum and gin. All are distinguished from commercial spirits by a distinctive taste, imparted in each case by a special mode of preparation. When genuine they are never placed on the market until two or three years after distillation; but they can be readily counterfeited from ordinary newly-distilled spirits, and in practice the quantity so counterfeited is much greater than the quantity that is genuine. All these four liquors are bases of numerous popular barroom drinks. *Punches*, *cocktails*, *fizzes*, *smashes*, *slings* and the like are seductive concoctions of spirituous liquors (sometimes, however, of vinous liquors instead) with sugar, spices, fruit juices and various other articles; *grog* is plain distilled liquor and cold water; *toddy* is a mixture of liquor, hot water and sugar.

The percentages of alcohol in the leading beverage spirits are differently stated by different authorities. This will be seen by comparing the following table (from the United States Dispensatory, 1887) with Mulhall's list on p. 19:[1]

LIQUORS.	PER CENT. BY WEIGHT.	PER CENT. BY VOLUME.
Scotch Whiskey	42.8	50.3
Irish "	42.3	49.9
American " (old)[1]	52.2	60.0
English "	41.9	49.4
French Cognac (brandy)	47.3	55.0
Rum	42.2	49.7
Gin	40.3	47.8
German "Schnapps"	37.9	45.0
Russian "Dobry Wutky"[2]	54.2	62.0

[1] The actual alcoholic percentage of American whiskey is less than these figures indicate. [2] Good vodka.

The liquors are separately considered below.

Whiskey (from *usige-beatha*, Celtic for "water of life"; later form, *usquebaugh*, Irish or Gaelic for the early whiskey of Ireland and Scotland).—Most of the whiskey of the United States is distilled from corn; the remainder from rye, malt, wheat, oats, barley and mill-feed. (See table, p. 172.) *Bourbon whiskey* (named from Bourbon County, Ky.) and *rye whiskey* are the common commercial kinds. As is explained on pp. 375–8, the honest whiskey of this country is almost exclusively the product of Kentucky, Pennsylvania and Maryland; and the annual production of what passes as honest whiskey is about 15,000,000 gallons, constituting only 15 to 20 per cent. of the entire quantity of grain spirits. But much of the so-called honest or "straight" whiskey is hastily thrust upon the market and poisonously adulterated with oil of creosote or pyroxylic acid, etc. The characteristic color of whiskey can be given to crude spirits in less than 12 hours' time by artificial processes. "There appears to be a class of distillers," says the Internal Revenue report for 1889 (p. 60), "who desire to market their product as soon as possible, and who, by heavily charring their barrels, adding a little caramel or prune juice, or by some of the so-called ageing processes, endeavor so to color their new and colorless whiskies as to deceive the consumer." The Scotch and Irish whiskies are produced largely from malt and barley, and are highly esteemed; but, as analysis discloses, they are frequently "made up," like the American, from alcohol, water, sugar, and tannic acid, acetic, pyroligenous and pyroxylic[2] acids. At the present day it is exceedingly difficult to obtain a pure article of whiskey through the ordinary channels of trade. In other countries, as Germany and Russia, whiskey is manufactured from potatoes and beets.

Brandy (older forms of the word, *brandywine* and *brandwine*, meaning burnt—or distilled—wine; akin to the present German *branntwein* [burnt wine]).—As its name indicates, brandy proper is distilled wine; and all brandy, as distinguished from whiskey and other spirits, is supposed to be the distilled product of the grape or other fruits. For many years past most of the superior grape brandy has been supplied from the cognac districts of France. By turning to pp 480–1 the reader will see that this supply has been enormously decreased by the phylloxera's ravages. The production of genuine grape brandy in other countries is comparatively small; in the United States it is really infinitesimal. Vintners cannot afford to distill their all too precious grape juice into brandy when this article can be so easily imitated from raw corn, potato and other spirits. One of the commonest counterfeits is a grain whiskey or beet-root spirit, colored and aromatized with cognac-flavored œnanthic ether or Hungarian oil.[1] Besides the very scarce grape product the only articles worthy of being regarded as brandies are the distillates of various fruits like the apple (yielding the familiar *apple-jack*), peach, blackberry and fig. But these fruit spirits are adulterated and marketed before they have been properly aged, the same as the grain alcohols.

---

[1] The second column of percentages (by volume) is the one with which comparisons should be made.

[2] Ten drops of this acid (oil of creosote) will kill a man in 15 minutes, and no counteractive is known in medicine.

Rum (contracted from *rumbullion*, provincial English for a great tumult).—This liquor is distilled from the juice of the sugar cane direct, or from molasses or other sugar cane products or refuse. The best rums come from the West Indies, especially Jamaica (see pp. 259–60) and St. Croix. In the United States there are several rum distilleries, using molasses as their material; and in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, they manufactured 1,657,808 proof gallons. Much of this is of the meanest quality and is shipped to Africa (see pp. 240–1). *New England rum* was formerly made in great quantities and was a favorite drink, notably the *Medford rum* (from the town of Medford, Mass.). But the cheapness of grain spirits has operated to reduce both the supply and the demand. All sugar-producing countries distill rum. There are hardly any alcoholic articles so vile and poisonous as the native rums of South Africa and adjacent islands, the *negro rum* of the West Indies and the rum or *caña* of the South American nations.

Gin (contracted from *geneva*, another common name for the same liquor, which is derived from the French *genièvre* [juniper]).—A strong spirit, slowly and carefully distilled from unmalted barley or rye (sometimes from other grain), combined with the juniper berry and other ingredients; after distillation it is rectified, sweetened and aromatized. The name *Hollands* is also frequently applied to gin, Holland being the country where it was originally produced and still the most important center of its manufacture. The Dutch varieties, known commercially as geneva, Hollands and Schiedam, are considered the best. The English gins, which are staple drinks throughout Great Britain and the United States, are made from raw grain spirit as a basis, the product being highly and perniciously flavored; frequently such adulterants as oil of turpentine, essential oils, alum, potassium carbonate, acetate of lead, sulphate of zinc, grains of paradise and cayenne pepper are introduced.[2] The appalling effects of gin drinking and the multiplication of gin-shops caused the English Parliament to pass stringent laws early in the 18th Century (see pp. 273–4); and it was this legislation that gave rise to Lord Chesterfield's speech in the House of Lords in 1743.[3] The United States manufactures comparatively little gin; in the fiscal year 1889–90 the entire product was 1,202,940 proof gallons.

LIQUEURS AND CORDIALS.

The numerous alcoholic beverages classed under these names are mixtures (or the distillates of mixtures) of brandy, alcohol or any spirit with other substances, generally sweetened with the syrup of refined sugar, and perfumed and highly seasoned with spices and various vegetable extracts. Some liqueurs are compounded from many substances by intricate processes, others are produced by comparatively simple methods; some depend upon the infusion of flowers, fruits, woods or herbs in water or alcohol, others upon the distillation of aromatics or combinations of aromatics. The distinction between liqueurs and cordials is not very clear, but there is a disposition to classify as cordials those liqueurs that require no very complex mode of manufacture and are relatively simple in composition; thus a beverage which is merely a sweetened spirit, or but slightly aromatized, is generally spoken of as a cordial. *Bitters* form a distinct group of liqueurs whose chief characteristic in common is their claim to possess certain tonic properties which give them a medicinal value. They are generally prepared by steeping some herb, leaf, blossom or root, dried or fresh, in spirits and otherwise doctoring the liquid to tickle the palate or excite the nerves and stomach and thus create a commercial demand for them.

Absinthe is one of the most powerful liqueurs, made from alcohol and the leaves and tops of varieties of artemisia (especially the common wormwood, *artemisia absinthium*, from which the name "absinthe" is derived), together with other aromatics, like sweet flag-root, angelica root, the fruit of star anise and the leaves of dittany of Crete. It has an emerald hue. The pure liqueur is a sufficiently violent poison, but drugs like tumeric, indigo and blue vitrol are added to deepen the color. It came into use as a beverage after the return of the French soldiers from the Algerian wars of 1844–7; these soldiers had made it a practice to mingle absinthe with their wines. The absinthe habit is regarded by many as the very worst one that drinkers can contract. The results are so alarming that the use of absinthe has been prohibited in the French army and navy. Epilepsy is one of the diseases that speedily overtake the absinthe victim. This liqueur is being consumed in increasing quantities in the United States, and several firms are engaged in manufacturing it here. But nearly all the absinthe is produced in Switzerland and France.

---

[1] Very much of the brandy sold in Great Britain and Ireland is prepared at home from ordinary grain alcohol by adding thereto argol, bruised French plums, some French wine-sugar, a little good cognac, and redistilling, when the spirit which passes over may be colored with burnt sugar or by being kept in an empty sherry cask. Occasionally grains of paradise and other acrid matters are added to give the brandy a fictitious strength, and catechu or oak-bark to give it an astringent taste.—*Chambers's Encyclopædia, article "Brandy."*

[2] In 38 specimens of gin examined by Dr. Hassall, the alcoholic strength ranged from 22.35 to 48.80 degrees, and the sugar present varied between 2.43 and 9.38 per cent.; 7 were found to contain cayenne pepper, 2 had cinnamon or cassia oil and nearly all contained sulphates.—*Encyclopædia Britannica, article "Gin."*

[3] The following is a part of that speech:

"Luxury, my Lords, is to be taxed, but vice prohibited, let the difficulties in executing the law be what they will. Would you lay a tax on the breach of the Ten Commandments? Would not such a tax be wicked and scandalous, because it would imply an indulgence to all those who would pay the tax? Is not this a reproach must justly thrown by Protestants upon the Church of Rome? Was it not the chief cause of the Reformation? And will you follow a precedent which brought reproach and ruin upon those who introduced it? This is the very case now before us. You are going to lay a tax, and consequently to indulge a sort of drunkenness, which almost necessarily produces a breach of every one of the Commandments. . . . The bill [to license gin-shops for the sake of revenue] contains only the conditions on which the people of this kingdom are to be allowed henceforward to riot in debauchery, licensed by law and countenanced by the magistrates. For there is no doubt that those on whom the inspectors of this tax shall confer authority, will be directed to assist their masters in their design to encourage the consumption of that liquor from which such large revenues are expected, and to multiply without end those licenses which are to pay a yearly tribute to the crown. . . .

"When I consider, my Lords, the tendency of this bill, I find it only for the propagation of disease, the suppression of industry and the destruction of mankind. I find it the most fatal engine that ever was pointed at a people; an engine by which those who are not killed will be disabled, and those who preserve their limbs will be deprived of their senses. . . .

"As little, my Lords, am I affected with the merit of the wonderful skill which the distillers are said to have attained, that it is in my opinion no faculty of great use to mankind to prepare palatable poison; nor shall I ever contribute my interest for the reprieve of a murderer, because he has, by long practice, obtained great dexterity in his trade. If their liquors are so delicious that the people are tempted to their own destruction, let us at length, my Lords, secure them from the fatal draughts by bursting the vials that contain them; let us crush at once these artists in slaughter, who have reconciled their countrymen to sickness and to ruin, and spread over the pitfalls of debauchery such baits as cannot be resisted."

Anisette or *aniseed cordial* is a French liqueur prepared by flavoring weak spirit with coriander, seed of anise and sweet fennel seed, and sweetening with finely-clarified syrup of refined sugar.

Cassis (French) is made from black currants.

Chartreuse, one of the most celebrated of liqueurs, is produced by the monks of La Grande Chartreuse, near Grenoble, France. There are three different kinds, green, yellow and white. The mode of manufacture is a secret carefully guarded by the monks. The chief aromatics are believed to be wormwood, carnations and the young buds of the pine tree. Spurious chartreuse is common.

Cherry brandy is a name sometimes erroneously given to kirschwasser. Common cherry brandy is made by mixing brandy or spirits with cherry-juice or steeping cherries in spirits.

Kirsebaer, which comes from Copenhagen, is a cherry brandy.

Clove cordial, much in vogue among the English lower classes, is a spirit flavored with bruised cloves and colored with burnt sugar.

The well-known *curaçoa* takes its name from the Caribbean island Curaçoa, where it was first manufactured. Large quantities are now made in Holland by digesting in sweetened spirits the small curaçoa orange or orange peel and adding cinnamon and often a little mace or cloves.

Kirsch, *kirschwasser* or *kirschenwasser* (German, meaning cherry water), is distilled in Switzerland and the Black Forest region of Germany from the small black cherry. The ferment is made exclusively from the pulp of the cherry, but before distillation the stones are broken and their kernels are cast into the ferment. Various flavoring substances are frequently added. A most dangerous imitation is produced in France by treating spirits with cherry-laurel water, a rank poison.[1]

Kummel, *doppel-kummel* or *allasch*, a Russian liqueur, much used also (as well as imitated) in Germany and other countries, consists of a sweetened spirit flavored with cumin and caraway seeds, the extract of the latter being so strong as to conceal all other flavors.

Maraschino is the distilled product of a very fine and delicately-flavored cherry called marasques, grown only in Dalmatia, an Austrian dependency. The liqueur is sweetened with sugar.

Noyau or *crême de noyau* (also written *noyeau*) is a liqueur or cordial of two varieties (white and pink), prepared by flavoring brandy with the bruised kernels of the bitter almond. Peach and apricot kernels are sometimes substituted for or combined with the almond.

Peppermint liqueur has peppermint as its predominating flavoring extract. It is usually nothing more than ordinary sweetened gin mixed with the essential oil of peppermint.

Ratafia (written also *ratifia* and *ratafee*), a Prussian liqueur, is aromatized with the kernels of cherries, peaches, apricots and other fruits, spices and sugar being added. Ratafia is also the name of a flavoring essence having for its basis the essential oil of bitter almonds. In France the name ratafia is often applied to various liqueurs flavored with the kernels of fruit stones or seasoned with spices.

Trappistine (French) derives its name from its manufacturers, the Trappist monks of the Abbey de la Grâce Dieu. It is marketed in two varieties, a yellow and a green.

Vermuth or *vermouth* (French) is one of the lighter liqueurs and has white wine rather than spirits for its base. Absinthe and various aromatic drugs are ingredients.

The foregoing are the chief commercial liqueurs. Among the remaining ones are *benedictine*, *cacao*, *café*, *crême de rose*, *crême de vanille* (called also *vanille*), *mandarine*, *menthe*, *parfait amour*, *pomeranza*, and *the*.

OTHER DISTILLED DRINKS.

The distinctive names for the common distilled drinks of various nations—drinks that are counterparts of the different grades of commercial spirits, whiskey, etc., as known to Americans—are of very wide range. A few of the leading ones are mentioned below.

Arak (or *rakee*) is the common distilled drink of Palestine and Syria, made chiefly from damaged figs and the refuse of wine-grapes. *Arrack* is a name of broad signification, covering, in a general way, the spirituous liquors of many Oriental countries, especially Arabia, Egypt, India, Java, Ceylon, Siam, and Cochin China; it is made from different materials in different countries—from palm toddy, rice, molasses, cocoanut milk, dates, grape refuse, etc. Other well known Eastern articles are distilled *koumiss* (otherwise known as *araca*, *arsa* and *araca asa*), from fermented mares' milk, long in use among the Tartars; *saké*, the Japanese whiskey (from rice, molasses, etc.), and *samshu*, Chinese spirits (principally from rice). *Eau de vie* is French for brandy; *schnapps* is German for spirits of all kinds; *poteen* or *potheen* is Irish for whiskey (especially for whiskey illicitly distilled by the Irish peasantry); *vodka* is Russian for spirits or whiskey.

State.—Just where the functions of civil Government begin and end, has, from the dawn of history, been a theme for discussion. Two diverging schools may be traced more or less distinctly throughout the discussion. With one the constant aim has been to curtail the powers of Government and to enlarge those of the individual; and as all philosophy will run at times to the extreme, this philosophy that the best Government is the one which governs least, has run to its extreme in Anarchism. The other school has contended that, with the increasing perplexities of social and industrial life, and the growing density of population, the necessity arises for more and more interference, on the part of Government, with the activities of the individual. At the extreme of this school is Communism, with its ownership of all things in common.

It is of interest to note the bearing of these two schools under different forms of Government. Under monarchical forms the school that sought to enlarge civil functions became associated in history with resistance to liberty and promotion of despotism. The "Liberal" was he who sought to lessen the rights of the King and to increase those of the individual. But under republican government this attitude becomes almost exactly reversed. In England to-day the Tories or Conservatives, who are the most strenuous opponents of any enlargement of governmental functions, now that Government has come into the hands of the people, are the political and as a rule the lineal descendants of those who contended for the enlargement of those functions when Government was in the hands of a King. In the meantime the Liberalism which a few centuries ago meant opposition to all extension of governmental powers, has come to mean rather the opposite.

It is easy to conceive from which school come the philosophical objections to the principle of Prohibition. By those who hold with Mill and Spencer that the line of progress for society is in the direction of less law rather than more, Prohibition is, at first glance, viewed as a retrograde step, as an unwarrantable invasion upon the domain of personal habits, as an attempt of the majority to dictate what a man shall drink.

---

[1] See the United States Dispensatory (1887), p. 240.

The objection on this score will be found, however, to arise from a misconception, in most cases, of the scope and purpose of the Prohibitory law, as regarded at least by its leading advocates. For no Prohibitory statute has been framed that proposed to treat with a man's personal habits or private appetite. Such law deals entirely with the traffic—with the barter and sale of liquor, or with the manufacture for purposes of barter and sale. In preventing the traffic, the law may indeed remove many of the facilities for gratifying the appetite, and it is hoped that with the removal of these facilities the gratification will cease. But the law does not, even indirectly, compel it to cease. One may still, under Prohibitory law, brew his own beer or distill his own whiskey, for private use. It is only when he places it in the market that the State claims the right to interfere.

The right of the State to regulate, restrain or forbid any form of *traffic* which is considered inimical to the common weal, is one which it is useless to cite authorities to establish. As a matter of fact, every Government retains the right of control over all forms of public traffic, and a large proportion of the statutes of any State are those dealing with traffic. There is, indeed, no form of traffic to which the State does not, to some extent, dictate the conditions under which it can be prosecuted. For instance, the State determines a certain standard of weights and measures. A circulating medium is established as legal tender for all mercantile transactions. The number of hours of labor is frequently determined. Bankrupt laws are made. Forms of contract are settled by law. At almost every point trade and traffic encounter the provisions of law determining the conditions for their existence. Prohibition is (despite the word itself) but the defining by law of the conditions under which the traffic in liquor shall be prosecuted. The conditions are more stringent than with most forms of traffic, solely because the public dangers are greater and much more difficult to guard against. Whether or not these conditions are ones it is wise to impose, there can be little doubt of the State's legal and constitutional right to impose them if it thinks them wise. This right has been affirmed by the highest Court in the land.

Another phase of the question is awakened by the thought that the State *cannot*, in the case of a traffic, refuse to do one of two things, namely, either to protect or to prohibit. It must do one or the other. If it refuses to prohibit, it must in the nature of the case protect. There are many forms of personal conduct, not in themselves wise or prudent, with which the State refuses to interfere. Its refusal cannot be construed by any into a sanction of the conduct. A man may over-eat, or abuse his eyes by over-reading, or expose himself foolhardily—Government simply refuses to interfere. So with drinking: a man may over-drink, and Government pays no attention to the fact till the results begin to affect others than the drinker. The Government, in these cases, neither sanctions nor condemns; it simply refuses to interfere. But in the case of a traffic the State must necessarily take either the attitude of protection or of prohibition. At every step the traffic calls upon the State for protection, and if there is not prohibition the protection is forthcoming. The property rights of liquor are established. Contracts are enforced. Debts are sued for and their payment compelled. In fact, if it were not for the protection which the Courts give, it would be next to impossible for the business to be carried on except in the most meager dimensions.

If, then, the State must either protect or prohibit, shall it not have the right to say which it shall do? and shall it not decide the question with a view to conserving public order, public health and public morality, rather than with a view to furnishing facilities for the gratification of personal appetites?

The advocates of Prohibition base their appeal to the State upon the recognized public evils which flow from the saloon. They ask, not that the State shall interfere to prevent the drinker from injuring himself, but to prevent the saloon, by the allurements it necessarily presents, from injuring the public interests, endangering public order and increasing the burdens of taxation. "Trade is a social act," says John Stuart Mill in his "Essay on Liberty." It is this "social act" of barter and sale, not the individual act of drinking, with which the State is asked to deal.

There is no theory of government (except the theory of no-government) which denies the duty of the State to prevent one member of society from violating the rights of another. The advocates of Prohibition rest their entire case on the assertion that the saloon is an infringement not so much on the rights of the drinker as of the non-drinker; that it endangers public order and public health, foments crimes of violence, increases taxation and counteracts to a great extent all the remedial forces which society has set in action and is supporting. If this assertion cannot be established the case for Prohibition falls to the ground confessedly. If it is established, then there is no theory of civil government with which Prohibition, rightly understood, is not in harmony.

E. J. Wheeler.

Stewart, Gideon T., second candidate of the Prohibition party for Vice-President; born at Johnstown, N. Y., Aug. 7, 1824. His parents removed to Oberlin, O., when he was 13 years old. Here he obtained his education and began the study of law, which he completed at Columbus, O. He commenced the practice of his profession at Norwalk, O., in 1846. For the next 20 years he was engaged chiefly in newspaper work, as editor of the Norwalk *Reflector* and Dubuque (Ia.) *Daily Times*, and as one of the proprietors and publishers of the Toledo *Blade* and *Commercial*. He opposed slavery and supported the Union, and was active in the Whig and Republican parties. He has been identified with the temperance reform since his early youth. In 1847 he helped organize the Norwalk Division of Sons of Temperance, and he is still a member of that body. Uniting with the Good Templars, he was three times chosen the chief of that Order in Ohio. In 1853, during the Maine law campaign, he made an attempt to form a permanent Prohibition party, and in 1857 he was Chairman of a State Convention held at Columbus with a view to establishing such a party. He took a prominent part in the work which resulted in the creation of the new party in 1869; has been its candidate three times for Governor of Ohio, eight times for Supreme Judge and twice for Circuit Judge; was for four years Chairman and for 15 years a member of the National Committee, and was the nominee for Vice-President in 1876. The Ohio Prohibition Conventions of 1876, 1880 and 1884 indorsed him for the Presidency, but he refused to permit his name to be presented in the National Conventions. He is now (1891) engaged in the practice of law in Norwalk, where he has lived since 1866.

Stimulants.—The normal invigoration of the human organism can be effected only by wholesome food, sleep, fresh air, exercise and judicious changes of temperature. The belief in the possibility of accomplishing the same result by means of drastic drugs is one of the most mischievous popular fallacies, and owes its origin probably to the circumstance that exceptional and altogether abnormal conditions of the system may now and then justify the employment of such drugs for the purpose of (temporarily) arousing special organs from a state of morbid lethargy. The frequent or habitual resort to such expedients has become a principal cause of disease, and is based on a delusion which may be defined as the *tendency to mistake a process of irritation for a process of invigoration.*

Every poison (see Poisons) can in that sense be abused for the purposes of stimulation, and may reduce the organism to a state of abject dependence on its baneful influence. Under the spur of a virulent drug the prostrate vitality rises as a weary sleeper would start at the touch of a venomous serpent, and, as danger will momentarily overcome the feeling of fatigue, the organism labors with restless energy till the poison is expelled. This feverish reaction dram-drinkers and the dupes of the "bitters" quack mistake for a sign of returning vigor, persistently ignoring the circumstance that the excitement is every time followed by a prostration worse than that preceding it.

Feeling the approach of a relapse the stimulator then resorts to his old remedy, thus inducing another sham-revival, followed by an increased prostration, and so on; but before long the dose of the stimulant, too, has to be increased, the stimulant-dupe becomes a slave to his "tonic," and passes his life in a round of morbid excitements and morbid exhaustions—the former at last nothing but a feeble flickering-up of the vital flame, the latter soon aggravated by sick headaches, "vapors" and hypochondria.

The stimulant habit in its most prevalent forms—"exhilarating beverages," "tonic medicines" and "prophylactic bitters"—is a delusion that has wrought more mischief than any other single cause of disease. A healthy man needs no artificial excitants; the vital principle in its normal vigor is an all-sufficient stimulus. The scant vital resources of an invalid should not be wasted in the paroxysm of a poison-fever. Inspiration bought at the rumshop is but a poor substitute for the spontaneous exaltations of a healthy mind in a healthy body. Playing with poisons is a losing game; the sweetness of the excitement is not worth the bitterness of the inevitable reaction. In sickness stimulants of that sort cannot further the actual recovery by a single hour. There is a strong restorative tendency in our physical constitution; nature needs no prompter; as soon as the remedial process is finished the normal functions of the organism will resume their work as spontaneously as the current of a stream resumes its course after the removal of an obstruction. All the objections against the use of such drugs as hasheesh and opium can with equal force be urged against all forms of alcoholic "tonics." Alcohol has, with absolute conclusiveness, been proved to have no nutritive value and to be devoid of any elements available for the production of organic warmth and vigor; its stimulating effect is invariably followed by a depressing reaction, and its influence on the system is in all respects that of a virulent poison.

Felix L. Oswald.

Strong Drink is one of the general terms for alcoholic beverages of all kinds, including beer and wine, and other so-called light liquors. It has a special application to the distilled articles, but the fermented ones also are suggested by the term.

Stuart, Moses.—Born in Wilton, Conn., March 26, 1780; died in Andover, Mass., Jan. 4, 1852. He graduated from Yale College in 1799; studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1802; was a Yale tutor for the next two years; studied theology and was ordained pastor of a Congregational church in New Haven in 1806; was elected Professor of Sacred Literature in Andover Theological Seminary in 1810, and occupied this chair for 38 years. He wrote several Greek and Hebrew grammars and various works on biblical literature. In 1830 he prepared a competitive temperance essay which was awarded a prize of $250. It dealt with the duties of Christians and churches. In it Dr. Stuart earnestly championed the opinion that "Wherever the Scriptures speak of wine as a comfort, a blessing or a libation to God, and rank it with such articles as corn and oil, they mean—they can mean only—such wine as contained no alcohol that could have a mischievous tendency; that wherever they denounce it, prohibit it and connect it with drunkenness and reveling, they can mean only alcoholic or intoxicating wines." He was one of the earliest, ablest and most scholarly writers on the Bible Wines question.

Sumptuary Laws are measures whose peculiar and direct object is to control, modify or regulate certain practices or affairs of individuals that are usually governed by private right, preference, interest or enterprise, by circumstances of association, etc. These measures give extreme application to the theory of paternal government for the individual; prescribing style and cost of dress for different classes of citizens (or forbidding the wearing of particular articles or limiting the expenditure), indicating kinds of food that may be or must not be consumed, fixing prices at which commodities are to be sold, regulating the stipends to be paid employes, and in other respects providing rules of more or less strictness for the direction of daily life and personal conduct. Such laws were numerous in ancient Greece, especially among the Lacedæmonians;

the requirements that no Spartan should possess gold or silver money, and that Spartan women (prostitutes excepted) should dress with the utmost simplicity, are specimens of these enactments. The Romans had elaborate sumptuary regulations both in the early days of the Republic and in the reigns of the most dissolute and wasteful of the Emperors. In mediæval times the enactments of France and England and other countries rivaled the most oppressive ones of Sparta. An English law of 1363 provided that servants should not eat more than one meal of meat or fish in a day. Rigid sumptuary legislation came practically to an end in England during the 17th Century. The American colonists, notably the New Englanders, instituted many curious and arbitrary restraints. The sumptuary spirit was still active during the Revolution: in 1777 a committee of Congress submitted a report recommending that the States fix by law the prices of labor, manufactures and internal produce, as well as the charges of inn-holders; and in consequence of this recommendation the States of New York and Connecticut passed the suggested legislation.[1]

Laws prohibiting or otherwise interfering with the liquor traffic are not properly sumptuary. They are not recognized as such by standard legal writers. They deal essentially with the public traffic as a public evil, and never question the right of the individual to drink unless by the act of drinking he publicly violates the policy which the State has inaugurated solely for the promotion of the general welfare. They abridge incidentally the liberty to drink, but this abridgment is for the sake of lessening the fearful burdens and ills that rest upon the State, and not for the sake of dictating to the individual. Blackstone carefully distinguishes between different forms of liberty—natural, civil and political,—and shows the justice and necessity of laws for the correction of the public effects of drunkenness, regardless of the effects upon apparent natural liberty. (See PERSONAL LIBERTY.) It is significant also that Blackstone (Commentaries, 19th Eng. ed., vol. 4, p. 170) formally alludes to different sumptuary acts of England but does not, in this connection, make any mention of Excise or other liquor measures, although the enacting clauses of such measures frequently announced that their purpose was to attack the vice of intemperance. The derivation of the word "sumptuary" (from the Latin *sumptuarius*, from *sumptus*, meaning expense, cost) indicates that sumptuary legislation relates peculiarly to expense or expenditure.

Sunday-Closing of saloons is required by law in all but four States of this country—California, Montana, Nevada and Texas; in California and Texas it may be compelled by ordinance. It is required throughout Canada, in Scotland (since 1853), in Ireland, excepting in certain cities[2] (since 1888), in Wales (since 1886), in New Zealand and in most of the Australian colonies. It is desired by a large majority of the citizens of England, as attested by petitions from more than 5,000,000 people in six recent years, by the favorable answers of four-fifths out of a million householders whose opinions were recently taken and by a two-thirds vote of the House of Commons (March 24, 1886). (N. B.—By Sunday-closing, as the term is here used, is meant complete closing, not a closing for certain hours. England already has partial Sunday-closing, the traffic being prohibited during the ordinary hours of church services.)

Few question the propriety and practical benefits of Sunday-closing. It is notorious that there are violations; side-doors and back-doors are utilized for the Sunday business and the dealers are often so bold that they admit customers with little or no discrimination, not fearing the interference of the police. But even where secret violations are general and systematic, it is manifest to everybody that conditions are markedly better than where "wide-open" saloons are tolerated on Sunday. An unwonted outward respect is shown for the better sentiment of the community, the quiet of the day is less seriously disturbed and loafers and blackguards do not congregate around the saloon entrances. Sunday-closing is an object-lesson of the good tendencies of Prohibition. If enforcement is satisfactory there is an instant and great decrease in the number of arrests for drunkenness, disorder and crime. The improvement in Philadelphia during the first year of the Brooks law was due chiefly to the largely reduced number of Sunday commitments: these commitments aggregated 679 from June 1 to Nov. 1, 1887 (when Sunday-closing was not enforced), but there were only 194 such commitments from June 1 to Nov. 1, 1888 (when the saloons were closed on Sundays). In Scotland the number of Sunday arrests was reduced seven-eighths by the enforcement of Sunday Prohibition.

---

[1] Kent's Commentaries, 13th ed., pp. 331-2.

[2] See p. 258.

Sweden. — The manufacture and even the use of spirits were prohibited by various early Kings of Sweden: Gustavus Vasa (16th Century) repeatedly forbade the use; Gustavus Adolphus prohibited whiskey in 1622, and the prohibition was well enforced until his death (1632); Charles XII. prohibited the manufacture of this liquor in 1698, and in 1718 (his Cabinet meantime, in his absence, having revoked the prohibition) he limited the number of distilleries to four; in 1756 the party called the "Hats" succeeded in enacting Prohibition again, the eminent naturalist, Carl von Linné (Linnæus), giving his approval to the movement; and finally in 1771 Gustavus III., in deference to public sentiment, began his reign with Prohibition of the whiskey traffic. But Gustavus, following the example of Russia, decided to procure revenue from spirits, and notwithstanding the blessings resulting from the law he repealed it in 1774 and established crown stills on the Russian plan. In 1787 "leasehold" stills were introduced, and in 1809 "domestic" stills. Distilleries multiplied until in 1834 their number was estimated at 170,000 in a population of three millions, and it was reckoned that 45,000,000 gallons of spirits were consumed annually.[1] Efforts to check the evil were now begun. The King (Charles XIV.) encouraged the formation of temperance societies. (See p. 40.) In 1835 the renowned Archdeacon Wieselgren commenced his active work for temperance, speaking and writing indefatigably. The cause advanced with considerable rapidity, and in 1854 the labors of Wieselgren (who was assisted by Magnus Huss and other able men) were rewarded by very encouraging words from a Special Committee of the Diet. "The researches of the philosopher and the honest feelings of the ordinary man," said this Committee in its report, "have led us to the conclusion . . . that the comfort of the Swedish people—even their existence as an enlightened, industrious and loyal people—is at stake unless means can be found to check the evil." In 1855 was passed a licensing act which abolished domestic stills, gave to parochial authorities (subject to the approval of the Provincial Governor) the right to fix annually the number of spirit-shops and public houses, instituted a system of so-called "factory distillation" and classified the different kinds of drinking establishments. The number of distilleries was immediately reduced from 44,000 in 1850 to 4,500; and in 1869 the number had decreased to 457. The annual product of spirits fell from 26,000,000 gallons to 6,900,000 gallons.

In 1864 the Council of the city of Gothenburg took steps that led to the inauguration, the next year, of the famous Gothenburg system. Gothenburg is a thriving seaport, the second city of Sweden, with fine educational and religious institutions. Yet great poverty and wretchedness prevailed among its common people, and in 1855 the police figures showed that the annual arrests for drunkenness were in the ratio of 11.14 for every 100 of the population. The Council, not wishing to go to the extreme of Prohibition, decided to remove from the whiskey traffic all incentives to gain and to restrict it with the utmost rigor. Accordingly a company (or Bolag) was formed, which was to operate a limited number of public houses, to make of them eating-houses where spirits could be obtained only in connection with food, to make no sales of spirits on credit, to employ as managers only respectable persons (who should derive no profits whatever from the sale of distilled drinks, but only from food and malt liquors), to pay into the city treasury all the net profits and to secure strict supervision of all the public houses by co-operating with the police and appointing private inspectors. The Bolag began its career in 1865, when all public house licenses excepting seven (which were held by private persons under certain vested rights) were transferred to it. In 1875 all the grocers' licenses were given to the company. The original licenses granted to the Bolag were 61 in number ; and all but 41 of these were gradually extinguished. Of the 41 remaining, 25 were used for ordinary public houses, nine were transferred to restaurants and seven were reserved for retail shops selling exclusively for consumption off the premises. Of the 20 grocers' licenses acquired by the company in 1875, seven were suppressed and the remaining 13 were turned over to private wine-merchants, "exclusively for the sale of the higher class of spirits and liquors not in ordinary use by the working-classes." This Gothenburg system is probably the most honest restrictive license method ever devised. It has been highly praised by many writers, but the results have been far from satisfactory. Intemperance is still an evil in Gothenburg, and the drink business is given high respectability and great fiscal importance. The temperance radicals of Sweden complain quite as bitterly against this method as the Prohibitionists of America do against High License. It is noticeable that so prominent a newspaper as the Gothenburg *Handelstiduing* (*Commercial Journal*), formerly a supporter of the policy, now approves the idea of whiskey prohibition.

---

[1] Dawson Burns's "Temperance History," part 1, p. 86.

Many parishes or communes are under absolute Prohibition. In the cities the Gothenburg system is generally in force.

The production of spirits in 1886 was 10,611,412 United States gallons; importation, 7,821,440; exportation, 6,786,127; consumption, 11,646,725, or 2.47 per capita. The revenue of the National Government from spirits is about one-sixth of the total revenue, and ranges from $3,000,000 to above $4,000,000 annually.

Total abstinence societies are strong, the Good Templars and Blue Ribbon Union being especially conspicuous. The clergymen (notably those of dissenting denominations) show much interest. There is a growing political demand for Prohibition. The Swedes in America give generous support to the aggressive Prohibition work.

C. A. Wenngren.

Switzerland.[1]—The drink customs of Switzerland closely resemble those of France and Germany. The population in 1888 was 2,933,612. The quantities consumed in 1884 were, in round numbers: spirits, 7,000,000 gallons; wine, 50,000,000 gallons; beer, 25,000,000 gallons, mead, cider, etc., 25,000,000 gallons. In the same year the number of places of all kinds where drinks were sold was 21,633. According to the records of the insane asylums 3,874 patients were cared for in these institutions during the years 1877–81, and 825 of these (or 21.3 per cent.) were victims of alcoholism. May 16, 1887, by a two-thirds vote of the people, the manufacture, importation and sale of spirits became Government monopolies. This change was made after long discussion in the Federal Council and among the people. It was opposed by some (especially church newspapers) on moral grounds, the argument being raised that the Government should not become a party to a traffic so injurious to the people.[2] The advocates of the new system maintained that a purer article of spirits would be produced if the Government conducted the stills, and that a larger revenue would be secured. These claims seem to be sustained by experience. It is also asserted that there has been a reduction in the per capita consumption of distilled liquors since the present law took effect, and these definite figures are given: consumption of spirits per head in 1885 (before Government control), 7.25 liters; in 1888 (under Government control), 5.50 liters. Indemnity was paid the distillers and liquor-dealers. The wine and beer traffic is undisturbed by the new regulations. The total abstinence movement in Switzerland has not made much headway. In 1877 the total abstinence Société de la Croix Bleue (Blue Cross) was started at Geneva by Rev. L. L. Rochat, and in 1887 it had about 4,000 adult members. Prohibition has not yet been seriously proposed. Swiss scientific writers (notably Dr. Farel of Zürich and Prof. Bunge of Basle) are giving much attention to alcoholism.

Tax.—Some anti-Prohibitionists, to meet the moral objections to the license system that are so strenuously urged, advocate the taxing of the liquor traffic without formerly licensing it. The tax, as distinguished from the license method, is the policy of the United States Government, which simply takes cognizance of the existence of liquor manufacturers and sellers and requires them to contribute to the Federal revenues, but does not in so many words decree that those so contributing shall have the sanction of license. The practical distinction between tax and license, even on moral grounds, is, however, of little importance. A tax may not formally, but it does impliedly, recognize the taxed business as a proper one; for nothing can more distinctly indicate public sanction of a traffic than the Government's willingness to accept a part of its profits. The States of Michigan and Ohio have prohibited the issuance of liquor licenses; but the intent of the prohibition has been circumvented by the enactment of tax laws. In both these States the actual effects of the tax method have been quite as unsatisfactory as the effects of undisguised license statutes.

---

[1] Prof. R.W. Moore of Strassburg, Germany, furnishes the Government statistics in this article; Mr. Joseph Malins of England contributes other particulars.

[2] United States Consular reports, vol. 23, pp. 45-8.

Taxes as Affected by Prohibition.—See pp. 545–51.

Temperance.—This word, as applied to the use of intoxicating liquors, is variously defined. The liquor-dealers and drinkers insist that "true temperance" is moderation. But moderation itself is a very indefinite term; that which is (or is supposed to be) moderation for one drinker may be excess for another. Besides, one of the peculiar and best-understood developments of so-called temperate or moderate drinking is the gradual creation of an intemperate and immoderate tendency and habit. Undeniably, the best temperance is purity, the purity that comes from the proper use of right things and entire abstinence from evil things. "By abstaining from sensual indulgences," says Aristotle, "we become temperate." Xenophon declares that the term "temperance" means, first, moderation in healthful indulgence, and second, abstinence from things dangerous, as the use of intoxicating wines. (See p. 221.) St. Thomas Aquinas says: "There are things contrary to soundness or a good condition of life, and the temperate man does not use these in any measure, for this would be a sin against temperance." (See p. 599.) It is by virtue of good authority, therefore, that the word "temperance," as specifically used at this day, is generally recognized as an equivalent for "total abstinence." By the temperance creed, the temperance societies and the temperance movement, as spoken of in the press and in ordinary conversation, are meant the creed, societies and movement of the abstainers and the radicals.

Temperance Hotels.—See COFFEE HOUSES.

Templars of Honor and Temperance.—A secret fraternal Order, organized Dec. 5, 1845, by members of the Sons of Temperance. In 1849 it separated from the latter Order. It was the first secret total abstinence organization to admit women, which it began to do on separating from the parent society. It was also the first to form a junior department, for boys. Such a department was organized in 1880. Its object is wholly educational. There are now (1891) 15 Grand Temples, with subordinate Temples in most of the States.

Temptation.—Races, like individuals, have special proclivities. There are certain vices to which they are prone. Climate, heredity and environment are the three strands in this cable of predisposition. The tropics, for instance, breed languor. Tropical races find their bane in idleness and licentiousness. The frigid and temperate zones, on the other hand, provoke gluttony and drunkenness. "If you would know what are the fundamental traits of a race," remarks Carlyle, "catch it and study it before Christianity and civilization have tamed it."

Look at our race in the light of this maxim. Tacitus describes the ancient Britons as having ravenous stomachs, filled with meat and cheese, heated with strong drink. Taine paints them as gluttons and drunkards (History of English Literature, vol. 1., p. 26, *seq.*). To the same effect is the testimony of Bede (lib. 1.). And the greatest of American orators, summarizing the classic authorities, shows that our German ancestors, before they streamed out into Christian civilization, conceived of heaven as a drunken revel, and regarded the drinking of blood from the skulls of their enemies as a foretaste of Paradise. (Speeches, Lectures and Letters, by Wendell Phillips, p. 498.) What is bred in the bone will come out in the flesh. Witness England, Scotland, Ireland, Holland, Germany and North America today; all of them the victims of what an old poet calls "liquid damnation." Drunkenness is in the Anglo-Saxon blood.

As though this racial inheritance and tendency were not enough, chemistry invents a new devil, alcohol, and makes it so cheap that everybody may have a familiar spirit. The Roman legions that trod the world into servitude had no stimulant stronger than vinegar and water. To-day there is not a hod-carrier who cannot earn in a forenoon the means of getting and keeping drunk.

Nor is this all. With such blood in our veins, and with this cheap stimulus in the market, we have multiplied dram-shops until the great centers of population are honey-combed with them. Like the ship-wrecked sailor, who, when he saw a gallows, thanked God that he had been cast ashore in a Christian country, so we recognize in the groggery a distinctive symbol of modern civilization. Long after all honest places are shut and barred the groggery flames out to entice and engulf—the "blazing lighthouse of hell." It is the most prominent and obtrusive feature of city life, and it is only less frequent and frequented in our villages and hamlets.

By common acknowledgment the saloons are the manufactories of crime and criminals, the trysting-places of vice, the allies of the brothel, the breeders of poverty, dealing at wholesale and retail in misery; the saloon system is the despair of law and order, the *raison d'étre* of police and prison, a chronic assault upon property and life, organized anarchy. Yet the State licenses the saloons—it legalizes temptation! The thief—it sends him to jail. The murderer—him it hangs. But the thief-maker, the manufacturer of murderers, it commissions. For so many dollars dropped into its palm, the State permits this temptation to ensnare and damn. Thus with one hand it strangles the victim and with the other it protects the victimizer. Will not the future Tacitus, when he looks back to study our times, count this as the most curious of historic monstrosities?

With drunkenness in our blood, with alcohol cheap and with temptation made legal, we have adopted democratic institutions where the law has no sanction but the purpose and virtue of the masses. "Here," exclaims an eminent authority, "the statute-book rests not on bayonets, as in Europe, but on the hearts of the people. A drunken people can never be the basis of a free government. It is the corner-stone neither of virtue, prosperity nor progress. To us, therefore, the title-deeds of whose estates and the safety of whose lives depend upon the tranquillity of the streets, upon the virtue of the masses, the presence of any vice which brutalizes the average mass of mankind and tends to make it more readily the tool of intriguing and corrupt leaders, is necessarily a stab at the very life of the nation." Shall we legalize that stab?

CARLOS MARTYN.

Tennessee.—See Index.

Texas.—See Index.

Thompson, H. A., third Vice-Presidential candidate of the Prohibition party; born in Center County, Pa., March 23, 1837. Graduated at Jefferson College in 1858; was elected President of Otterbein University, Westerville, O., in 1872, having been for several years before Professor of Mathematics in that institution. He has been identified with the Prohibition party from its foundation, and was a candidate for Congress from the 8th District of Ohio in 1874, candidate for Lieutenant-Governor of Ohio in 1875 and for Governor in 1877. In 1876 he was Chairman of the National Prohibition Convention, and he has been Chairman of the Ohio State Committee for many years and was President of the National Prohibition Alliance since its organization in 1877.

Tobacco.—The name of the plant is said to be derived from the island Tabaco, or from Tabasco, a Mexican province where Spaniards first saw this narcotic used as a luxury. Others derive the word from tabacos, a Caribbean pipe in which the drug was smoked. In 1560 Nicot gave the weed to Catherine de Medici; hence the familiar name, "Nicotian weed." The virulent alkaloid nicotine, found in the dry leaf, takes its name from Jean Nicot. Monumental sculptures in China suggest great antiquity in the use of tobacco. Humboldt says that it has been cultivated from time immemorial. For many centuries, some writers contend, its use was confined to South America, but since the days of Columbus it has extended through the world, notwithstanding the opposition of Governments and the efforts of reformers. In 1590, Shah Abbas affixed penalties to the indulgence, but many fled to the mountains rather than forego it. In 1624, the Pope anathematized all who defiled the house of God by carrying even snuff. The next year the Grand Sultan Amurath IV. prohibited smoking as unnatural and irreligious. The penalty was death. The Muscovite who was found snuffing had his nostrils split. The Grand Duke of Moscow made chastisement the penalty for the first offense of bringing tobacco within his realm, and death that for the second. Queen Elizabeth declared that its use reduced one to the condition of the savages whose habits were thus imitated. King James I. wrote in his "Counterblaste to Tobacco," that smoking was "loathsome to the eye, hateful to the nose, harmful to the brain and dangerous to the lungs," and that the stench nearest resembled "the horrible Stygian smoke of the pit which is bottomless." In his "Anatomy of Melancholy" Burton admits the medicinal virtues of the weed, but says: "As it is used by most men it is a plague, a mischief, a violent purger of goods, lands and health; hellish, devilish; the ruin and overthrow of body and soul."

In 1616 its cultivation began in Virginia. In 1620, 90 respectable English women were imported by Jamestown planters for wives at the price of 120 lbs. of tobacco, then worth 50 cents a pound. The next year they were worth $75 in tobacco. Cigars were not generally known in Europe till about 1814, when Austria began State factories for their manufacture. During the next 42 years, 6,000,000,000 were made in those factories. About two thousand million cigars have been exported from Cuba in a single year. In 1850, four hundred thousand acres of our soil were devoted to this plant. Gen. John H. Cooke of Virginia wrote: "Tobacco exhausts the land beyond all other crops. As a proof of this, every homestead from the Atlantic border to the head of tide-water is a mournful monument. It has been the besom of destruction which has swept over this once fertile region." Thomas Jefferson said: "We find it easier to make one hundred bushels of wheat than one thousand pounds of tobacco, and they are worth more when made. The culture of tobacco is productive of infinite wretchedness." The United States leads with an average yearly crop of more than 280,000 tons. In 1888 the total product was 565,795,000 lbs., of which Kentucky contributed 283,306,000, Virginia 64,034,000, Tennessee 45,641,000, Ohio 35,195,000, North Carolina 25,755,000 and Pennsylvania 24,180,000.[1] The value of the (unmanufactured) crop in 1888 was $43,666,665. Leroy Beaulieu gives the consumption per 100 of inhabitants in European countries thus: Spain, 110 lbs.; Italy, 128; Great Britain, 138; Russia, 182; Denmark, 224; Norway, 229; Austria, 273.

Tobacco belongs to the genus *Nicotiana*, and natural order *solanaceæ*. It is a near kin to stramonium or thorn-apple, to hyoscyamus or henbane, to belladonna or deadly night-shade. It may be administered as an infusion, an oil, an ointment, or as the wine of tobacco. The acrid, volatile principle is nicotine. It contains malic acid, albumen, supermalate of lime, a soluble red matter, chlorophyl, nitrate of potash, chloride of potassium, sal ammonia and water. There is about 7 per cent. of nicotine in the strongest tobacco. The dark, acrid, empyreumatic oil in tobacco-smoke is an active poison. The ashes of the weed contain carbonates of lime and magnesia, sulphate of potash and chloride of potassium. Free carbon settles on the back of the throat of confirmed smokers, says Dr. B. W. Richardson, and on the bronchial membrane, creating often a copious secretion, and when coughed up a coal-colored sputum. The biting sensation on the tongue is caused by ammonia, which dries the throat and leads to drinking. The dioxide present is the cause of the lassitude and headache which the fumes occasion. He admits that the use of tobacco was harder for him to abandon than that of wine. Tobacco is a powerful physiological antagonist of strychnia, being an immediate depressant. When introduced into the stomach and lungs or by rectal and hypodermic injection in lethal doses, the motor nerves are paralyzed and the pupils contracted. Delirium follows, with cold, clammy perspiration. Nothing but prussic acid equals tobacco in this rapidity of action. Count Bocarmé killed Fougniès in five minutes by a toxic dose. Another case is quoted in Bartholow's "Materia Medica," when death followed in three minutes. Necropsy reveals either an empty heart or black fluid. Clonic spasms may precede the paralysis. Death comes from the paralyzing action of the drug on the muscles of respiration.

---

[1] Our imports of tobacco (leaf and manufactured) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, aggregated in value $21,710,451; the imports from Cuba alone were valued at $11,088,240. The exports of all kinds of tobacco in the same year had a value of $25,355,601. More than two-fifths of our unmanufactured tobacco product is exported, the exports of leaf tobacco in 1890 having aggregated 241,313,740 lbs.

Itch and other skin diseases have been treated by the local application, but the use is perilous. Before ether was introduced this poison, in the form of an enema, was employed to relax the muscles in reducing hernia and dislocations, but soon fell into disrepute. Asthma and chronic bronchitis have been relieved by inhalation of tobacco-smoke, and the wine of tobacco is used as a laxative. The cigar, like the wine-cup, is claimed by its victims to aid digestion. The drunkard makes the same assertion as to his bottle. Dr. McAllister of Utica says that the habitual smoker "weakens the organs of digestion and assimilation and at length plunges into all the horrors of dyspepsia." It is, unquestionably, useful as an antaphrodisiac; but there is the opposite peril of impotence. It is antiparasitic; but the poison harms the tissues more than the invader, oftentimes. Lockjaw is greatly relieved by this poison; but there is danger of asphyxia if unskilfully administered. It is serviceable, says Bartholow, in cardiac dropsy. "It is, however, so disagreeable in action that few practitioners have the temerity to prescribe it, and few patients are willing to swallow it. So many unfortunate accidents have resulted from the external application of tobacco that its use in this way is rarely justifiable."

The burden of testimony from individual users and scientific writers is decidedly against tobacco. It is true that in the case of tobacco as in the case of alcoholic liquors many claim that "moderation" does little or no harm. But the difficulty or uncertainty of moderation and the possibility or probability of alarming excess are candidly recognized. Intelligent men, who are confirmed slaves of the habit, almost invariably declare that they advise others not to contract it; and it is with the greatest disapprobation and sorrow that smokers and chewers find that their examples are copied by their sons. Such dissuasives as these are re-enforced by many familiar facts: the tobacco habit in all its forms is extremely offensive to multitudes of people, especially to women; it induces the use of intoxicating drink; it is very expensive; it is accompanied by the disgusting vice of spitting; the conviction is widespread among medical authorities that it is at least an occasion of cancer;[1] in general and in particular it impairs the value of life; the carelessness of smokers is responsible for innumerable disastrous fires, etc., etc. Though it is willingly conceded that the public ills occasioned by tobacco are not so conspicuous as those resulting from the liquor traffic—that it does not bear comparison with that traffic as a contributor to the volume of crime, violence, disorder, pauperism and political corruption,—the general consequences are similar in tendency to the results of the alcohol vice. Yet if the public evils are left entirely out of consideration, the injurious effects upon individuals are so manifest and so general as to excite the gravest concern.

The student of the subject is referred to the following authorities: Dr. J. Bigelow, in "Nature and Disease," pp. 323–36; Sir Benjamin C. Brodie, "Use and Abuse of Tobacco," vol. 1; Sir Andrew Clarke, vol. 2, "Detached Pieces;" J. H. Griscom, "Evils of Tobacco;" T. W. Higginson, "A New Counterblast," in his "Outdoor Papers," pp. 177–99; J. Lizars, "Use and Abuse of Tobacco;" James Parton, "Smoking and Drinking;" Dr. B. W. Richardson, "Diseases of Modern Life," pp. 272–323; J. Shew, "Effects of

---

[1] The *Medical Times and Gazette*, Oct. 6. 1860, records the excision of 127 cancers from the lips, and nearly every one of the patients a smoker. Dr. J. C. Warren of Boston gave his experience as surgeon for 30 years, just before his death, on the same point. "Smoking is the most common cause of cancer in the mouth," says Prof. Bouisson.

Tobacco;" Dr. E. P. Thwing, "Facts about Tobacco," 1879; F. W. Fairchild, "History of Tobacco;" J. Jennings, "History of Tobacco;" H. P. Prescott, "Tobacco and Strong Drink;" H. L. Hastings, Boston, "Trask Tracts."—Magazine articles: *Harper's*, vol. 5, "History and Mystery of Tobacco," by T. B. Thorpe; vol. 20, "A Pipe of Tobacco," by C. Nordhoff; *Bentley's Miscellany*, vol. 15; *Atlantic Monthly*, 1860, "Effects of Tobacco;" *North American Review*, 1869, Dr. W. A. Hammond on Tobacco; *Blackwood*, 1856, "Drinking and Smoking."

E. P. Thwing.

The tobacco taxes are, next to the liquor taxes, the most important ones levied by the United States Government on domestic articles. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, the revenues from tobacco were:

Cigars and cheroots, $12,263,669.95; cigarettes, $1,116,627.34; snuff, $737,731.27; chewing and smoking tobacco, $18,325,481.36; special taxes on dealers in leaf tobacco, $44,492.40; special taxes on dealers in manufactured tobacco, $1,331,118.24; special taxes on manufacturers of tobacco, $5,197.50; special taxes on manufacturers of cigars, $122,896.49; special taxes on peddlers of tobacco, $11,776.51—total, 33,958,991,06.

The numbers of persons engaged in the different branches of the tobacco trade in 1890 are shown by the following figures:

Manufacturers of cigars, 21,197; dealers in leaf tobacco (in quantities not exceeding 25,000 lbs.), 4,090; the same (exceeding 25,000 lbs.), 1,364; retail dealers in leaf tobacco, 3; dealers in manufactured tobacco, 603,068; manufacturers of tobacco, 907; peddlers of tobacco, 1,600—total, 632,229.

The tax provisions (both internal and customs) of the different Federal laws enacted since the foundation of the Government are summarized below:

Act of 1794, *c.* 51.—Snuff manufactured in United States taxed 8 cents per pound; snuff imported, 12 cents per pound; imported tobacco, 4 cents per pound.

Act of 1795, *c.* 43.—Each mortar in a snuff mill worked by water, $560; each pair of millstones and each pestle in mills not worked by hand, $140; worked by hand, $112; each mill manufacturing snuff by stampers and grinders, $2,240 per annum. *Penalties.*—Failure to make entry of particulars in regard to mills, forfeiture of mill and $500 fine; manufacturing without license, a fine treble the duties charged. Six cents per pound drawback on snuff exported. These duties were repealed in 1800, c, 36.

Tariff Act of 1842.—Imported leaf tobacco, 20 per cent. ad valorem; cigars, 40 cents per pound; snuff, 12 cents per pound; other manufactured tobacco, 10 cents per pound.

Tariff Act of 1861, *c.* 68.—Cigars valued at $5 or less per 1,000, 20 cents per pound; valued at $5 to $10, 40 cents; valued over $10, 60 cents and 10 per cent ad valorem. Snuff, 10 cents per pound; leaf tobacco, 25 per cent.; manufactured, 30 per cent.

Tariff Act of 1862, *c.* 163.—Duties on cigars increased to 60 cents to $1 per pound, according to grades as above, and 10 per cent. ad valorem added on highest grade. Snuff, 35 cents per pound; leaf tobacco, 25 cents; manufactured, 35 cents.

Internal Revenue Act of 1862, *c.* 119.—Retail tobacco-dealers taxed $10 per annum. Chewing tobacco, valued at more than 30 cents per pound, 15 cents; less, 10 cents; smoking tobacco made partly with stems, 5 cents; made exclusively of stems, 2 cents; snuff, 20 cents; cigars, valued at $5 per 1,000 or less, $1.50; $5 to $10 per 1,000, $2; $10 to $20 per 1,000, $2.50; over $20 per 1,000, $3.50.

Act of 1864 (*Internal*), *c.* 173.—Tax on chewing tobacco raised to 35 cents; smoking, to 25 cents; smoking (all stems), to 15 cents; snuff, to 35 cents. Cigarettes in paper, not worth over $5 per 100 packages, $1 per 100 packages; all tobacco, or cheroots, valued at not over $5 per 1,000, $3 per 1,000. Cigars, $5 to $15 per 1,000, $8; $15 to $30, $15; $30 to $45, $25; over $45, $40.

Tariff Act of 1864, *c.* 171.—Duties on cigars valued at less than $15 per 1,000, 75 cents per pound and 20 per cent. ad valorem; $15 to $30, $1.25 and 30 per cent.; $30 to $45, $2 and 50 per cent.; over $45, $3 and 60 per cent. Snuff and manufactured tobacco, 50 cents per pound; unmanufactured tobacco, 35 cents.

Act of 1865 (*Internal*), *c.* 78.—Cigars, cheroots and cigarettes all of tobacco, $5 per 1,000 irrespective of value; cigarettes in paper, 5 cents per package of not more than 25. Tax on tobacco raised about 5 cents per pound.

Act of 1866 (*Internal*), *c.* 184.—Chewing tobacco, 40 cents per pound. Cigars valued at less than $8 per 1,000, $2 per 1,000; $8 to $12, $4; over $12, $4 and 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Act of 1868 (*Internal*), *c.* 186.—Dealers in leaf tobacco whose annual sales did not amount to over $10,000, $25; above that, $2 per $1,000 of annual sales. Manufacturers of tobacco, $10, with $2 per $1,000 if the bond exceeded $5,000. Manufacturers of cigars, $10, with $2 per $1,000 additional if sales exceeded $5,000. Tax on manufactured tobacco slightly reduced. Cigars reduced to $5 per 1,000, cigarettes to $1.50 per 1,000, when weighing not exceeding three pounds per 1,000.

Tariff duty (1868) on imported cigars, $2 per pound and 20 per cent. ad valorem, and the Internal Revenue tax in addition.

Act of 1872 (*Internal*), *c.* 315.—Retail dealers in leaf tobacco, $500 if their sales did not exceed $1,000, and 50 cents for each additional dollar of sales. All dealers in tobacco, $5; manufacturers, $10; peddlers afoot or in public conveyances, $10; with one horse, $15; two horses, $25; more than two horses, $50.

Act of 1875 (*Internal*), *c.* 127.—Tobacco, 24 cents per pound; cigars, $6 per 1,000.

Act of 1879 (*Internal*), *c.* 125—Tobacco, 16 cents per pound.

Tariff Act of 1883, *c.* 121.—Cigars, $2.50 per 1,000 and 25 per cent. ad valorem; leaf tobacco for wrappers, 75 cents per pound; if stemmed, $1; other unmanufactured tobacco, unstemmed, 30 cents; manufactured tobacco, 40 cents; snuff, 50 cents.

Act of 1883 (*Internal*), *c.* 121.—Manufactured tobacco, 8 cents per pound; taxes on dealers reduced about one-half; cigars, $3 per 1,000; cigarettes weighing under three pounds per 1,000, 50 cents.

Tariff (*McKinley*) *Act of* 1890, *c.* 1244.—Leaf tobacco suitable for cigar wrappers, unstemmed, $2 per pound; stemmed, $2.75; unmanufactured tobacco, unstemmed, 35 cents; stemmed, 50 cents; manufactured tobacco, 40 cents; snuff, 50 cents; cigars, $4.50 per pound and 25 per cent.

Act of 1890 (*Internal*).—Manufactured tobacco, 6 cents per pound; all special taxes on dealers removed.

Among the most interesting State acts of recent years are those prohibiting the sales (sometimes also the giving) of cigarettes and other kinds of tobacco to minors, except (as provided in most instances) on the written consent of parent or guardian. These are analyzed in the following table:

STATES.	WHEN PASSED.	MAXIMUM AGE.	PENALTY.
Arkansas	1889	15	$10 to $50.
Connecticut[1]	1889	16	$50.
Georgia	1889	..	Misdemeanor.
Idaho	1889	21	$100.
Illinois	1887	16	$20.
Indiana	1889	16	$1 to $10.
Kansas[2]	1889	16	$5 to $25.
Kentucky	1890	18	$5 to $25, or imp. 30 days max., or both.
Maine	1889	16	$50 max.
Maryland[3]	1886	14	$10 to $100, or imp. 5 to 30 days.
Massachusetts	1886	16	$50 max.
Michigan	1889	17	$5 to $50, or imp. 10 to 30 days.
Minnesota	1889	..	$50 max., or imp. 30 days max., or both.
Nebraska	1885	15	$25.
Nevada	1887	18	$200 max., or imp. 60 days max., or both.
NewHa'pshire	1889	..	$20 to $50.
New Jersey[4]	1883	16	$20.
New York[5]	1889	16	Misdemeanor.
North Dakota	1890	16	$50 max., or imp. 30 days max., or both.
Ohio	1888	15	$5 to $20, or imp. 30 days max.
Pennsylvania	1889	16	$300 max.
South Carolina	1889	18	$25 to $100, or imp. two months to one year or both.
South Dakota	1890	16	$50 max., or imp. 10 days max., or both.
Utah[2]	1890	18	$10 to $100.
Vermont	1888	16	$20 max.
Washington	1883	16	$10 to $50.

An act of Congress for the District of Columbia, approved Feb. 7, 1891, forbids the selling, giving and furnishing of tobacco in any form to a minor under 16; the penalty being a fine of $2 to $10, or imprisonment 5 to 20 days.

Total Abstinence from all intoxicating beverages, though inculcated and practiced from the earliest times by Jewish, pagan and Christian sects, and enjoined by the founders of great religions, as the Mohammedan and Buddhist, did not become a distinct popular creed in modern Christian nations until after the first quarter of the present century had expired. The foundations for the movement were laid in the United States; throughout the world it is recognized that this country was the first one to practically inaugurate and nourish the reform. The period of preparation may be said to date from 1785, the year in which Dr. Benjamin Rush published his essay against ardent (distilled) spirits. Various temperance societies were instituted in the next 40 years, notably the society at Moreau, Saratoga County, N. Y., in 1808 (see p. 82), and the Massachusetts Society in 1813. This Massachusetts Society did not go so far as Dr. Rush had gone, for its object, as stated in its constitution, was to "discountenance and suppress the *too free* use of ardent spirits." A prime cause of the conservatism of the early reformers was the general belief that the intoxicating ingredient in wine and beer was one of the natural elements of fruit and grain. In 1826 Justin Edwards, D.D. (see p. 161), with Leonard Woods, D.D., issued a call for a meeting in Boston, which was held on Jan. 10 of the same year; and on Feb. 13 the organization of the "American Society for the Promotion of Temperance" was effected. Its basis was abstinence, but for several years there was no general application of the principle to fermented drinks, although some eschewed all intoxicants. By 1834, as shown by Dr. Edwards's seventh annual report, the movement had spread to 21 States and more than 5,000 county and local societies had been organized, with a membership exceeding a million; the liquor business had been made odious and many good men had withdrawn from it; the importations of distilled liquors had decreased from 5,774,774 gallons in 1824 to 2,810,140 in 1832, and there had also been a very striking reduction in the domestic output. Yet the use of wine and cider had increased, 5,421,631 gallons of wine having been imported in 1832 as against 1,310,731 gallons in 1824.

---

[1] A minor using tobacco in any form to be fined $7.
[2] Prohibits furnishing tobacco in any form to minors, except upon prescription of a physician.
[3] An amendment added in 1890 prescribes the same penalty for furnishing tobacco to any minor.
[4] Suit to be prosecuted by parent or guardian; fine to go to the county.
[5] Another law (1890) forbids minors under 16 to use tobacco in any public place under penalty of $2 to $10 fine.

The first National Temperance Convention met in Philadelphia, May, 1833, with more than 400 delegates in attendance from 21 States. It expressed the conviction that "the traffic in ardent spirit as a drink, and the use of it as such, are morally wrong, and ought to be abandoned throughout the world." But there was no declaration against fermented liquors. The second Convention, at Saratoga, in August, 1836, took the final step, extending the principle of abstinence so as to cover "all intoxicating liquors," and the American Temperance Union was organized. From this radical action all the aggressive work of later years has been developed. The American Temperance Union, under the direction of devoted men like Dr. John Marsh (see p. 416) faithfully represented the uncompromising opinion until, in 1866, it was replaced by the equally zealous National Temperance Society. At the succeeding National Temperance Conventions (Saratoga, July, 1841; Saratoga, August, 1851; Saratoga, August, 1865; Cleveland, July, 1868; Saratoga, August, 1873; Chicago, June, 1875, and Saratoga, June, 1881), the total abstinence doctrine was enthusiastically favored and the growing demand for Prohibitory legislation, enforcement of laws, political action, etc., was reflected.[1] The latest of the general Conventions of the temperance people was held in the Broadway Tabernacle, New York, June 11 and 12, 1890, and about 800 delegates were chosen by various organizations, churches, etc.; all who disagreed with the total abstinence and other radical ideas had full liberty to send representatives, and some of their recognized champions were present; but the sentiment in favor of the most advanced opinions was overwhelming—indeed, practically unanimous.

The total abstinence cause is now represented in the United States by several powerful national organizations, the most important being the National Temperance Society, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Independent Order of Good Templars, Sons of Temperance, Catholic Total Abstinence Union, Loyal Temperance Legion, Royal Templars of Temperance and Templars of Honor and Temperance. These are noticed under the appropriate titles in this work. Other societies, like the Rechabites (p. 582), United Order of the Golden Cross (membership, about 17,500) and Sons of Jonadab are more or less active. Nearly every State has a State Temperance Society. Besides, there are countless local and unaffiliated bodies; and hundreds of thousands of citizens not identified with organizations are in full sympathy with the movement. At this day there is but one national association of temperance people that does not insist on total abstinence (p. 81).

The propaganda has the fervid support of the clergy as a class, of numberless professional, business and public men, the representative leaders of the working people and a very great majority of the women. The zeal of its adherents is remarkable, and the greatest generosity is exhibited by interested individuals. Very large sums of money are contributed for advancing special phases of the agitation. Through the liberality of Mr. W. Jennings Demorest of New York, elocutionary contests for silver, gold and diamond medals are held in all parts of this country and in nearly all foreign countries. The youthful participants in these contests vie with each other in delivering carefully selected and striking pleas against the drink curse and the license system. The chief object of Mr. Demorest and those associated with him is to cultivate the most radical sentiment, especially in behalf of uncompromising Prohibition, and to encourage the young people to enlist earnestly in the work against the traffic. Mr. Demorest's generosity has been unbounded, and he welcomes every new occasion for practical expenditure.[2]

---

[1] An extended account of the total abstinence movement from 1785 to 1885 (including the texts of pledges adopted by numerous organizations, and other valuable verbatim matter) is given by H. K. Carroll, LL.D., in "One Hundred Years of Temperance," pp. 121-41.

[2] The Demorest medal contests were inaugurated in 1886. During the first two years about 1,000 medals were awarded. In 1888 and 1889 the work was extended to Europe, especially England and Scotland. In 1889 the number of contests was three times as many as in all the

The principles on which total abstinence, in opposition to so-called "moderate" drinking, are based, are summarized in the article on MODERATION. The proofs of the benefits of the entire disuse of alcoholic drinks are so explicit and authoritative (see especially LONGEVITY and MEDICINE[1]) that no argument against the expediency of total abstinence can now be maintained. The head of the most widespread and conservative religious denomination of Christendom declares that "it cannot at all be doubted" that "the noble resolve to abstain totally from every kind of intoxicating drink" is "the proper and the truly efficacious remedy." (See p. 598.) In all departments of life (except, perhaps, among the most ignorant and prejudiced people) the individual who uses no intoxicating drink is regarded as more reliable and estimable (qualifications, etc., being of an acceptable nature) than the drinker. There is a constantly-increasing tendency among large employers of labor to discriminate against persons using liquors, and the regulations of the railway corporations in particular are remarkable for their stringency.[2]

Treating.—Perhaps in no othe country in the world is the fashion o treating more in vogue than in th United States. This custom is the caus of much drinking and drunkenness that would otherwise be avoided. Men who are habitual partakers of beer, whiskey, brandy, etc., are not satisfied to indulge their personal appetites, but must needs, for politeness's sake, as they imagine, or in order not to appear mean, or to return favors received, invite their companions to drink with them. Treating begins often in childhood in things innocent, and has its origin in unselfish motives and noble impulses; but when transferred from the sphere of the harmless to the deadly, the peril is great and the disaster national. It may safely be said

---

preceding years. In 1890 about 10,000 medals were distributed, the expenses being in the neighborhood of $20,000. Mr. Demorest's total outlay since the beginning has been fully $30,000. Number of medals awarded up the 1st of January, 1891: 14,934 silver, 1,021 small gold, 53 grand gold, and 3 diamond. The State of Nebraska leads, having won 2,500 of the medals, including all the three diamond ones. Contests have been held in every State and Territory. In New York City alone 120 churches are represented. Bulgaria has secured 16 of the medals, and among the other remote foreign countries in which the work has been introduced are India, the Sandwich Islands, China, Japan, Australia and Tasmania. The motto adopted is, "From Contest to Conquest." Mrs. Charlotte F. Woodbury of New York is the Superintendent.

[1] Besides the different "medical declarations" quoted on pp. 423–4, the following resolutions, adopted by the Section on Medicine of the International Medical Congress held in Philadelphia in 1876, are of special interest:

"1. Alcohol is not shown to have a definite food value by any of the usual methods of chemical analysis or physiological investigation.

"2. Its use as a medicine is chiefly that of a cardiac stimulant, and often admits of substitution.

"3. As a medicine it is not well fitted for self prescription by the laity, and the medical profession is not accountable for such administration or for the enormous evils arising therefrom.

"4. The purity of alcoholic liquors is in general not as well assured as that of articles used for medicine should be. The various mixtures when used as medicine should have definite and known composition and should not be interchanged promiscuously."

It should be especially borne in mind that there is the very highest scientific authority for the assertion that total abstinence may be resorted to *at once* and *suddenly* without any injurious results "Persons accustomed to such drinks may with perfect safety discontinue them entirely, either at once, or gradually after a short time," said the eminent signers of the second English medical declaration (p. 423). The *Voice*, Sept. 4, 1890, printed letters from the officials of 43 prisons in the most populous counties of several States The officials were asked to state whether it was their practice to deprive prisoners of liquor instantly and entirely, or to pursue the "tapering-off" plan, and whether the effects of cutting off at once were beneficial or hurtful. A great majority testified that each inmate was refused liquor absolutely from the first day of confinement, and that the results were uniformly good.

[2] The New York *Independent*, Aug. 28, 1890, printed letters from the officials of 66 railway companies stating the policy pursued in relation to drinking habits. The *Independent's* object in securing this correspondence was to show "what is expected of railway employes, who form the best-drilled army of workmen in the country." The following are specimen rules:

Philadelphia & Reading.—"As the habitual use of intoxicating liquors is incompatible with the duties of railway employes, those who abstain from their use will be more favorably considered for promotion. The use of such liquors by employes on duty is positively forbidden, and the penalty for disregard of this order is dismissal from the service."

Lake Erie & Western.—"Intoxication or the use of intoxicating liquors will be sufficient cause for dismissal. Persons employed in any capacity who frequent saloons where liquor is sold, or gambling houses, will not be retained in the service."

Northern Pacific.—"The continued or excessive periodical use of *malt* or alcoholic liquors should be abstained from by every one engaged in operating the road, not only on account of the great risks of life and property incurred by intrusting to them the oversight of those whose intellects may be dulled at times when most care is needed, but also, and especially, because habitual drinking has a very bad effect upon the constitution, which is a serious matter for men so liable to injury as railway employes always are. It so lessens the recuperative powers of the body that simple wounds are followed by the most serious and dangerous complications. Fractures unite slowly, if at all, and wounds of a grave nature, such as those requiring the loss of a limb, are almost sure to end fatally. No employe can afford to take such risks, and the railway company cannot assume such responsibilities."

Missouri Pacific.—"The use of *beer* or other intoxicating liquors by any employe of this company while on duty is strictly prohibited, and no employe will be allowed to have any such liquors in or about any station, shop or yard or other premises of this company at any time or under any circumstances. Any conductor, trainman, engineer, fireman, switchman or other employe who is known to habitually use intoxicating liquors, either while on or off duty, will be promptly and permanently dismissed from the service of the company."

Similar rules, written or unwritten (in some instances stronger and in others somewhat milder, but all agreeing in requiring employes to be strictly temperate at all times, on pain of discharge), were reported by the officials of every other company represented in the replies. The words, "preference will always be given to those who do not indulge at all in intoxicating drink," recur frequently.

that if the American habit of "treating" could be allowed to fall into "innocuous desuetude," or reformed away, a large decrease of drunkenness would at once be noticed. Many young men fall and fill the drunkard's grave because their instincts are social and their temperament exposes them to conviviality, even though their natural aversion to liquor is great and they may at first loathe that which at last bites like a serpent. Not only temperance, but manly independence also, would be promoted by the abolition of treating and the return to the ancient *disner à escot*, where each man pays for himself, and puts himself under no obligation, owing no man anything. In the common colloquial phrase, "Jersey treat," where each settles his own bill, and neither tempts another nor binds himself, there is a reference to the early days in New Jersey when, under salutary customs, morality, temperance and good order prevailed; so that the term conveys a compliment where a sneer is possibly meant. It is possible that to the majority of men who live and die drunkards, the first glass came in the form of social temptation. In such a time the young man invited to a "treat" may well repeat the prayer which the Rev. T. De Witt Talmage, when a theological student, prayed in reference to the snares of a great city: "O Lord, may we hear the serpent's rattle in our ears, before we feel his fang in our flesh." "The old dram-drinker," says the proverb, "is the devil's decoy." With fiendish pleasure, the man able to drink without being made drunken too often puts the bottle to his neighbor's mouth, the strong man tempts the weak to gloat over it, and to chuckle to himself in Pharisaic glee because his stomach and nerves (and conscience) are not as weak as other men's. Such kindness is brutal cruelty; or, as the proverb has it, "Drinking kindness is drunken friendship." The history of words mirrors the steady degradation of the man who accepts the first invitation to partake of liquor. The Italian word tope, at first meaning "I accept your offer," "done," or "agreed," soon began to mean "to drink heavily," or "lustily," and in due time developed into "toper," which is now synonymous with "sot."

William Elliot Griffis.

Turkey.[1]—Throughout the dominions of the Sultan there has been a growing tendency to modify in practice the prohibition of wine contained in the Koran. While the use of wine is forbidden by that book, the manufacture is not; and grapes are grown and converted into intoxicants by many Mohammedans. Again, those who seek excuses for drinking argue that while wine must not be touched by good Mohammedans there is nothing said against spirits; and although spirits are much stronger than wine the products of the still are quite freely used. There is not much visible intemperance, and comparatively little wine-drinking, outside the Europeanized sections; but there can be no doubt that the vice of drinking has made serious inroads. Any observer in Constantinople will find that distilled liquor (or rakee, as it is called) is used openly by many Turks. In the capital there are no Prohibitory laws against strong drink, and no punishment is enforced by the authorities against the violator of religious doctrines. The Turkish Government actually collects a large revenue from taxes on spirits and wines, both domestic and imported, and it strives through its agents to augment this revenue by extending the sales to new places. Statistics of the liquor revenue are not published. In 1883–4 the imports of alcohol into Turkey were valued at 15,400,471 piastres (about $675,000); in 1886–7 the exports of wine had a value of 31,150,916 piastres (about $1,370,600), and the exports of opium 79,818,194 piastres (about $3,500,000). Bulgaria and Roumelia, formerly integral parts of European Turkey but now semi-independent States, produce much wine and support a considerable retail liquor traffic. In Roumelia the wine-yield in 1883 was in excess of 9,000,000 gallons. The Prefect for Philippopolis and 222 surrounding villages in Bulgaria (total population, 226,013, about one-tenth of the entire population of that country) published statistics in 1889 showing that 2,603,888 gallons of wine, valued at $284,698, were made in 1888 in the territory covered by the report, and that in Philippopolis (population, 33,032) there were 400 licensed drinking-saloons.

---

[1] The editor is indebted to Zoe M. Locke, Philippopolis, Bulgaria.

Unfermented Wine.—See Bible Wines, Communion Wines, and Passover Wines.

Unitarians.—In their formal relations to the temperance movement the Unitarians are represented by the "Unitarian Church Temperance Society," organized at the National Conference held at Saratoga, N. Y., Sept. 23, 1886.

"Its purpose is 'to work for the cause of temperance in whatever ways may seem to it wise and right; to study the social problems of poverty, crime and disease in their relation to the use of intoxicating drinks, and to diffuse whatever knowledge may be gained; to discuss methods of temperance reform; to devise and so far as possible to execute plans for practical reform; to exert, by its meetings and by its membership, such influence for good as by the grace of God it may possess.' It is composed of branch societies in sympathy with the above-named purpose, either in churches or Sunday-schools, and the regular meetings will be held once in two years in connection with the National Conference, each branch society being represented by two delegates."[1]

United Brethren Church.—The following is a part of the temperance utterances of the General Conference of the church, held at York, Pa., in May, 1889:

"We believe total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks to be the law of duty for the individual. We believe total Prohibition to be the divine law of duty for the State. We are unalterably and forever opposed to any and all forms of license and taxation, by whatever name called, which provide for the continuance of the traffic and not its destruction. . . . The Government which authorizes such a business and the voter who directly or indirectly consents to it are alike guilty of a great wrong."

United Kingdom. — See Great Britain, Ireland and Scotland.

United Kingdom Alliance.—See pp. 196, 197.

United Presbyterian Church.—The General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of North America, in Springfield, O., May, 1889, made the following declarations:

"That any form of license or taxation of the liquor traffic is unscriptural in principle and contrary to good government, and ought to be discouraged by every Christian, philanthropist and patriot.

"That we continue to indorse the proposition of former Assemblies, that total abstinence is the only safe rule for the individual, and Prohibition by law of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage the true method of dealing with this terrible evil by the State."

United States Government and the Liquor Traffic.[2]—Under the Constitution Congress, with the consent of the President (or by setting aside his veto by a two-thirds vote), has exclusive power to legislate upon questions of national revenue and expenditure, to "provide for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States," to enact laws for the District of Columbia and the Territories[3] as well as for the sites of forts, dockyards and all other national property, and to regulate intercourse with other nations and commerce between the States. Thus the National Government is able, at its own instance, without the co-operation of the separate States or despite their opposition, to foster or discountenance, tax or prohibit the liquor traffic on an extensive scale; it may levy taxes on the entire internal traffic for Federal revenue purposes and thereby give a certain recognition and sanction to it, or it may refuse, for various reasons, to take money from this business; it may lay duties on imported liquors, or admit them free, or prohibit them absolutely; it may interfere or decline to interfere with the exportation of liquors in general or to particular countries (as Africa); it may by treaty stipulations join in international agreements respecting the liquor trade; it may arbitrarily license, ignore or prohibit the traffic in all the Territories and the District of Columbia, in all Federal buildings and on all Federal grounds, among the Indians (who are the wards of the nation), in the army and navy, etc.; in short it may inaugurate a general policy of Prohibition or anti-Prohibition, of significant friendship for the temperance idea or of equally significant hostility or unconcern. On the other hand the National Government cannot enact liquor laws of any description for individual States; and it cannot disturb the measures that the States adopt for themselves, unless certain provisions of these measures are in conflict with the Federal

---

[1] Year-Book of the American Unitarian Association, 1891.

[2] The editor is indebted to Eli F. Ritter, A. M. Powell, Wilbur Aldrich, Henry B. Fernald, Mrs. Sarah A. McClees and Rev. Henry Ward, D.D.

[3] Congress may, however, waive the right to perform the ordinary legislative work for the District of Columbia and the Territories, and delegate this right to them. Accordingly the Territories (excepting Alaska and the Indian) have local legislative bodies; but the District of Columbia is under the immediate control of Congress. Yet no delegation of ordinary legislative powers deprives Congress of authority to pass special acts for any or all the Territories and the District of Columbia.

Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court. Thus the States are at liberty to license or prohibit the whole liquor business within their borders, subject only to the approval of the Supreme Court; and all the essential details of State Prohibitory acts are held to be valid by that highest tribunal excepting the ones which forbid the importation, and the sale in original packages, of alcoholic drink from other States or from foreign countries, and which (in the opinion of a majority of the Supreme Court) interfere with the exclusive right of Congress to regulate foreign and inter-State commerce. But Congress, recognizing the necessity of giving the States complete authority to control or suppress the traffic in all its forms, has explicitly authorized them to deal with transported or imported liquors in the same way that they deal with the liquors manufactured within their territorial limits; so that the National Government's powers embrace only the right of taxation, the right of legislation and administration in spheres beyond the jurisdiction of the States, and the right to submit to the States and with their consent ultimately to adopt a Constitutional Amendment.

Notwithstanding the freedom that the States enjoy, the liquor policy of the Federal Government cannot fail incidentally to materially influence their tendencies and to affect the conditions prevailing in them. If this Federal policy were distinctly hostile to the drink trade, undoubtedly the strength of local Prohibition movements would be vastly increased everywhere; with the prestige of active sympathy from Congress and the Administration, the anti-saloon agitation would probably sweep the country in a very brief time. But if the Government's attitude is clearly antagonistic to the temperance cause its example must shape the inclinations of the States; moreover, the encouragement that the liquor-traders derive from so powerful a patron must advance their interests in all parts of the country, advance them by the negative force of disfavor for Prohibition and by the positive results of legislative provisions and official complaisance.

INTERNAL REVENUE.

The history of Internal Revenue legislation is outlined on pp. 251–4. It shows that the purpose of the Government, in all the acts passed by it touching the general liquor traffic of the country, has been purely mercenary. The first act (1791, which, with the act of 1792, gave rise to the Whiskey Rebellion) contained a clause providing that the liquor taxes levied by it were to cease when the public debt should be paid. Much reluctance and caution were manifested in these and all the other early liquor measures. The Government, while desiring to procure revenue from the spirit-manufacturers, established no restrictions except such as were necessary for collection. Even petty private stills, which could not be properly inspected, were at first (acts of 1791 and 1792) permitted to operate without hindrance upon payment of the ordinary gallon tax, the quantities of liquor produced to be certified by the owners; but this system gave rise to frauds, and in 1797 the private stills were taxed according to capacity, though the details were so adjusted that no tax was to be paid when the distilleries were not running. Spirits distilled from foreign materials were to pay higher rates of taxes than those made from domestic materials; and thus distillation from the products of the United States was encouraged. The industry was further fostered by providing that taxes paid on spirits were to be refunded in case the spirits were exported.

The first era of whiskey taxation was brought to an end in 1802, when all the former laws were repealed. The emergencies of the War of 1812 caused a renewal of the system in 1813,[1] but in 1817 the Internal taxes were again abolished and no new ones were levied on domestic liquors until 1862. The act of July 1 of that year became the basis for all the elaborate regulations of the present day.

Taxes and Regulations Since 1862.—The main provisions, concerning liquors, of the Internal Revenue statutes enacted from 1862 to 1890, inclusive, are shown in the following summary:

---

[1] The act of 1813 prescribed these rates: Stills using domestic materials were to pay nine cents per gallon of capacity if operated for only two weeks, 18 cents if operated for a month, 32 cents if operated for two months, 42 cents if operated for three months, 52 cents if operated for four months, 70 cents if operated for six months, and $1.08 if operated for a year; those using foreign materials were taxed from 25 cents per gallon of capacity per month to $1.35 per year. The act of 1814 retained these rates and levied additional taxes of five cents per gallon of capacity and 20 cents for each gallon distilled. These additional taxes were removed by the act of 1816, but the original taxes on capacity were retained until 1817.

Distilled spirits and malt liquors are the only alcoholic articles taxed, domestic wine[1] and cider being exempt.

Section 3243 of the Revised Statutes makes the important provision that

> "The payment of any tax imposed by the Internal Revenue laws for carrying on any trade or business shall not be held to exempt any person from any penalty or punishment provided by the laws of any State for carrying on the same within such State, or in any manner to authorize the commencement or continuance of such trade or business contrary to the laws of such State or in places prohibited by municipal law."

The chief Internal Revenue acts are those of 1862, 1864, 1865, 1866, 1867, 1868, 1872, 1875 and 1879.

Taxes on Spirits.—Act of July 1, 1862, 20 cents per gallon.[2] Act of March 7, 1864, 60 cents. Act of June 30, 1864, spirits from whatever materials except grapes, $1.50; from grapes, 25 cents. Act of Dec. 22, 1864, spirits from whatever materials except grapes, to April 1, 1865, $2; from whatever materials except apples, grapes and peaches, after April 1, 1865, $2. Act of March 3, 1865, spirits from grapes, 50 cents; from apples and peaches, $1.50. Act of July 13, 1866, spirits from apples, peaches and grapes, $2. Act of July 20, 1868, spirits from apples and peaches, $2; from grapes, $1. Act of July 20, 1868, spirits from whatever materials, 50 cents. Act of June 6, 1872, spirits from whatever materials, 70 cents. Act of March 3, 1875 (still in force), spirits from whatever materials, 90 cents.[3]

Taxes on Malt Liquors.—Act of July 1, 1862, $1 per barrel.[4] Act of March 3, 1863, 60 cents per barrel until April 1, 1864, and $1 per barrel after that date. (The tax has remained $1 ever since.)

Special Taxes.—The present annual rates are: Brewers making more than 500 barrels per year, $100; less, $50. Manufacturers of stills, $50, and $20 for each still made. Rectifiers producing more than 500 barrels[5] per year, $200; less, $100. Retail dealers in distilled liquors,[6] $25; wholesale dealers in distilled liquors,[6] $100. Retail dealers in malt liquors (selling not more than five gallons at a time, and not dealing in spirituous liquors), $20; wholesale dealers in malt liquors, $50.

Administrative Provisions, Penalties, etc., of the Present Law.[7]—The office of Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as a branch of the Treasury Department, was created by the act of July 1, 1862. The act took effect Sept. 1, 1862. The Commissioner receives a yearly salary of $6,000 and has a Chief Clerk, Deputy Commissioner and Solicitor. The country is divided into collection districts, embracing separate States, parts of States or combinations of States and Territories, and the affairs of each district are administered by a Collector. Under each Collector are storekeepers and gaugers, assigned to the different distilleries and charged with the duty of closely watching all the details of manufacture and having custody of the liquors until the tax is paid. No revenue officer shall be interested in the manufacture (R. S., § 3168).

Every one liable to the tax must make detailed annual returns, according to the forms of the Department; and any one neglecting to do this, or making false returns, may be summoned to testify (§ 3173); and the Collector or his Deputy may enter the premises and make up the returns from his own observations and such evidence as he can get, adding 100 per cent. in case of a fraudulent return or 50 per cent. in case of no return (§ 3176); and officers may at any time enter the premises, resistance or rescue of property to be punished by fine of $500, or double the value of the property, or imprisonment not exceeding two years (§ 3177). Monthly returns also are required, with monthly payment of taxes, a penalty of 5 per cent., with an additional 1 per cent. per month, being assessed in case of delay (§ 3185). The tax is a lien upon all the property, and may be collected by distraint, and real estate may be seized for taxes (§ 3186–97).

If substances are added to create a fictitious proof the penalty is imprisonment three months to six years, and $100 to $1,000 fine, and forfeiture of the liquor (§ 3252). Penalty for evading the tax, double the amount of the tax (§ 3256); for defrauding the United States, forfeiture of the distillery and apparatus and spirits on hand, and fine of $500 to $5,000, and imprisonment six months to three years (§ 3257).

Any person having a still must register exact particulars with the Collector, on pain of $100 to $1,000 fine and imprisonment one month to two years (§ 3258). Every manufacturer of stills must give notice of each still made and the name of the person who is to use it (§ 3265). Stills cannot be used in or about any dwelling-house or boat, or any premises where malt liquor or vinegar or ether is produced or sugar is refined, or where any other business is carried on (§ 3266).

Each distiller must give bond not less in amount than the tax on his capacity for 15 days (§ 3260). A minute plan of each distillery must be filed with the Commissioner and Collector and posted on the premises (§ 3263). No distilling shall be done between 11 P.M. Saturday and 1 A.M. Monday (§ 3283). In each distillery shall be a receiving-cistern capable of holding 24 hours' product and so constructed as to be elevated from the floor and not to reach the ceiling, and to enable the officer to pass all around it; and this cistern and the room in which it is placed shall be under the lock and seal of the gauger, and spirits can be removed from it only under his supervision (§3267); and anyone tampering with the cistern is liable to fine of $500 to $5,000 and imprisonment one to three years (§ 3268); and all furnaces, tubs, doublers, worm tanks and pipes are to be built with clear space about them so that officers can have easy access to them (§ 3269); and the Commissioner may order any changes made about the distillery premises that he may deem necessary (§ 3270); and keys to distilleries must be furnished to officers, who may enter at any time of the day or night (§ 3278); and officers may break up ground or walls in order to search for pipes, cocks or other means of conveying or concealing spirits, mash or wort (§ 3278); and no rectifying establishment or vinegar[1] factory can be nearer than 600 feet to a distillery (§§ 3280, 3282*a*).

---

[1] For a short time, however (act of 1861), domestic wine made of grapes was taxed 5 cents per gallon. Imitation wines, prepared by mixing *foreign* wines with spirits, are now taxed 10 cents per pint (R. S., § 3328).

[2] The word gallon, when used in connection with United States taxes on spirits, means uniformly *proof gallon*—*i. e.*, a gallon one-half of whose volume is alcohol.

[3] For certain restricted purposes spirits are excepted from tax. (See p 637.)

[4] The malt liquor barrel in the United States contains 31 gallons (R. S., § 3339).

[5] In the United States a barrel of whiskey or spirits contains 40 proof gallons (R. S., § 3244).

[6] Designated in Internal Revenue parlance as "retail liquor-dealers" and "wholesale liquor-dealers," respectively. The retailer, in the meaning of the Internal Revenue law, is one who sells in quantities of not more than five wine-gallons at a time (R. S., § 3244).

[7] These provisions have been developed gradually. In the Internal Revenue statutes of war times and for some years subsequently the penalties were comparatively weak and the regulations were in no respects so exacting as the present ones. The first act prescribed a fine of $500 for fraudulent marking of goods, and a fine of $500 with forfeiture of the goods in question for defrauding the revenue. Frauds were so numerous that in 1864 the penalty for making false returns or no returns was a 50 per cent. increase of the tax and a fine of $1,000. Imprisonment was not then required.

Every distillery must have a warehouse on its premises for the storage of spirits in bond until the tax is paid, to be in charge of the storekeeper and under the joint management of storekeeper and proprietor (§ 3274). Spirits may remain in the warehouse for three years from the day of manufacture, but no longer; and the tax must be paid not later than three years after spirits are deposited in the warehouse (§ 3293); but the distiller may remove the goods at any time upon payment of the tax (§ 3294). If spirits are removed to any place but a bonded warehouse the tax must be paid immediately (§ 3253); but spirits for export are not taxed (§ 3330).[2]

The taxes on spirits accidentally destroyed are to be remitted (§ 3221), unless insured (§ 3223). Allowance is made for leakage in accordance with a fixed scale of maximums (§ 3294 *a*). The tax is remitted on alcohol withdrawn for chartered scientific institutions and colleges, provided this alcohol is to be used solely for preserving specimens or for experiments, etc., in chemical laboratories (§ 3297). An act of 1890 provides that any wine-maker may withdraw from a bonded warehouse spirits distilled from grapes to be used in fortifying sweet wines, and that grape spirits thus withdrawn shall be free from tax.[3] The United States Government may purchase spirits or liquors of any kind without paying the tax (§ 3464).

The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may exempt distillers of brandy made exclusively from apples, grapes or peaches from various provisions of the Internal Revenue laws,[4] but not from the tax (§ 3255); and grain distillers whose daily capacity is only 30 gallons may be exempted from certain provisions (§3255 *a*).

Sections 3287–3334, covering 30 pages, embody the most minute directions for gauging, warehousing, stamping and moving spirits, all devised for the purpose of keeping the product constantly under the eye of the Government officers until the tax is paid.

Brewers do not pay taxes on the malt or other materials that they use, but solely on the beer, at the rate of $1 per barrel of 31 gallons (§ 3337 *a*). They must make monthly returns to the Collector (§§ 3337–8). Any brewer evading the tax or making false entries is subject to fine of $500 to $1,000, and imprisonment for not more than a year, and forfeiture of his brewery, all its apparatus and all the beer on hand (§ 3340). Any brewer failing to keep books, or to furnish accounts to the Collector, or refusing to permit the proper officer to examine his books, shall pay $300 (§ 3340).

A special tax payment covers only one place of business and one business (§§ 3234–6). Everyone must keep his special tax stamp conspicuously posted in his place of business on penalty of double the amount of the special tax (§ 3239). A list of special taxpayers must be kept conspicuously in each Collector's office (§ 3240). A manufacturer of or dealer in distilled spirits who fails to pay the special tax is liable to a fine of $100 to $5,000, and imprisonment 30 days to two years, and forfeiture of the liquor and apparatus. A malt liquor manufacturer or dealer not paying the special tax must pay a fine not exceeding $500.

IMPORTED LIQUORS.

The rates of duty levied on imported liquors by different United States tariff laws are indicated below:

Act of 1789.—Spirits of Jamaica proof, 10 cents per gallon; all others, 8 cents. Madeira wine, 18 cents; all other wines, 10 cents. Beer, ale or porter in casks, 5 cents per gallon; cider, beer, ale or porter in bottles, 20 cents per dozen; malt, 10 cents per bushel.

Act of 1790.—Spirits, 12 to 25 cents, according to proof. Madeira wine, 30 and 35 cents; sherry, 25 cents; other wines, 20 cents. Malt liquors and malt, no change. Cider, free.

Act of 1791.—Spirits, 20 to 40 cents.

Act of 1792.—Spirits (grain), 28 to 50 cents; others, 25 to 46 cents. Madeira wine, 40 to 56 cents; sherry, 33 cents; St. Lucas, 30 cents; Lisbon, 25 cents; Oporto, 25 cents; Teneriffe and Fayall, 20 cents; all other wines, 40 per cent. ad valorem, not to exceed 30 cents per gallon. Malt liquors, 8 cents.

Act of 1795.—Wines, in no case less than 10 cents.

Act of 1800.—Wines, from 23 cents to 58 cents.

Act of 1816.—Spirits (grain), 42 to 70 cents. Wines, 25 cents to $1. Malt liquors in bottles, 15 cents; others, 10 cents.

Act of 1819.—Duties on non-enumerated wines reduced from 70 and 25 cents to 30 and 15 cents.

---

[1] Vinegar must not contain over 2 per cent. of alcohol (§ 3282*a*).

[2] Fermented liquors exported are also exempt from tax (§ 3441).

[3] Enacted at the demand of the California wine manufacturers.

[4] This section operates as a practical suspension of the ordinary Internal Revenue regulations so far as fruit distillers are concerned. These distillers are not subject to the constant espionage that grain distillers must endure. (See footnote, p. 375.)

Act of 1828.—Spirits, 15 cents in addition to the existing rate.

Act of 1832.—French wines, until 1834, 6 cents for red and 10 cents for white when in casks, and 22 cents per gallon when in bottles; after 1834, half these rates; other than French wines, half the existing rates.

Act of 1836.—Wines, duties reduced one-half.

Act of 1842.—Brandy, $1; other spirits, 60 to 90 cents. Wines, 6 to 60 cents. Malt liquors in bottles, 20 cents; others, 15 cents.

Act of 1861.—Brandy of first proof, $1; other spirits, 40 cents for first proof and proportionately larger rates for higher proofs. Wines, 40 per cent. Malt liquors in bottles, 25 cents; others, 15 cents.

Act of 1862.—Brandy of first proof, 25 cents; other spirits, 50 cents; cordials and liqueurs, 25 cents. Malt liquors, 5 cents.

Act of 1863.—Spirits, 40 cents in addition to existing duties.

Act of 1864.—Brandy, $2.50; other spirits, $2. Champagne, $6 per dozen quart bottles; other wines, 20 cents to $1, according to value, and 25 per cent. ad valorem. Malt liquors in bottles, 35 cents; others, 20 cents.

Act of 1865.—Spirits, 50 cents in addition to existing rates.

Act of 1870.—Spirits, $2. Wines (not to contain over 25 per cent. of alcohol), champagne, same as before; others, 25 cents to $1 + 25 per cent. according to value; bottled wines to pay 3 cents per bottle additional.

Act of 1875.—Still wines in casks, 40 cents; in bottles, $1.60 per dozen quarts.

Act of 1883.—Spirits, $2. Still wines, 50 cents; champagne, $7 per dozen quart bottles. Malt liquors in bottles, 35 cents; others, 20 cents.

Act of 1890 (*McKinley*).—See p. 239.

THE GOVERNMENT AND THE "TRADE."

The various revenue laws whose vital provisions we have analyzed have established the closest relations between the representatives of the Government and the representatives of the liquor business. The extent to which the Government depends on the traffic for its income is shown by the following statement of receipts during the year ended June 30, 1890[1]:

Internal Revenue from liquors	$107,695,909.83
" " " all other sources	34,910,795.98
Customs receipts from liquors	8,526,496.16
" " " all other sources	221,142,088.41
Receipts from public lands	6,358,272 51
Miscellaneous receipts	24,447,419.74
Total receipts	$403,080,982.63
" from liquors	116,222,405.99

Thus 29 per cent. of the entire revenue in 1890 was from the men manufacturing, importing and selling liquors. It has never been the policy of the Government, and is not now, to betray moral compunctions in taking its share of the profits of the drink trade. In the very latest report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that official declares that he is "gratified to state" that the Internal Revenue receipts have exceeded his estimates.[2] The entire traffic, from the national point of view, has enjoyed steady growth and a constantly increasing power since the Government came into formal association with it. (For details, see pp. 128–31, 372–8.) Indeed, the connection may be truthfully described as a partnership. The Government, through eminent officials, has been at pains to express warm friendship for the interests of the liquor men, and by practical acts has manifested great favor for them.

Fostering the Brewing Trade.—The annual reports of the United States Brewers' Association constitute an instructive record. At the first meetings of the Association, held soon after the Internal Revenue act of July 1, 1862, took effect, steps were taken to secure a reduction of the tax on beer, and this was accomplished; moreover the reports state that special efforts for favorable legislation at Washington were highly successful. In 1865 a representative of the Internal Revenue office (Mr. Wells) attended the Brewers' Convention (Baltimore, Oct. 18), and said:

> "It is the desire of the Government to be thoroughly informed of the requirements of the trade, and I will give information on all questions, in order to bring about a cordial understanding between the Government and the trade."

At the Convention of 1871 (Pittsburgh, June 7), another representative of the Department, Mr. Louis Schade, was present. "I have the more readily accepted," said he, "to comply with the request of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, inasmuch as I hope that by means of this mission I may be of advantage to you. . . . My convictions and feelings are with you, and all I can do for you will be done." The next year Mr. C. A. Bates was sent to the Brewers' Convention (New York, June 5 and 6) to officially speak for the Government. He said:

> "Let us take no backward step. I say us, for I am with you. The Commissioner of In-

---

[1] Figures of total receipts are from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury; figures of receipts from liquors are, respectively, from the report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the report on Commerce and Navigation.

[2] Report for 1890, p. 3.

ternal Revenue is with you. The President is with you."

In 1873 (Cleveland, June 4) the representatives of the Government in attendance were H. C. Rogers and Louis Schade. In 1877 (Milwaukee, June 6) the Convention received a letter from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Green B. Raum, who wrote:

> "I am glad to learn that the conduct of this Bureau has been satisfactory to such an important body of taxpayers as the brewers of the United States, and I trust that nothing will occur to disturb the friendly relations now existing between this office and your Association."

Commissioner Raum appeared personally at the Convention of 1878 (Baltimore, June 5), and said:

> "In regard to the system of Internal Revenue, I recognize it simply as a code of laws for the collection of revenues, not for the regulation of men's business, because I think the less the Government has to do in putting its nose in men's business the better. . . . I take pleasure in bearing witness that you have an officer at Washington who has at all times aided me in the enforcement of the law, and has given advice in bringing about such rulings that seem proper for the enforcement of the law."

In 1884 the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Walter Evans, responding to the invitation to be present at the Convention (Rochester, May 21 and 22), wrote: "I assure you of my best wishes for the success of your Association." The Convention of 1890 (Washington, May 21 and 22) was graced with the presence of the Commissioner, John W. Mason, who made a very fulsome speech, saying, in part:

> "Our business relations for the last year have been quite extensive, and I may say—speaking for the officers of the Commission of Internal Revenue—that they have been of a pleasant character. In order that they may continue so, and that the pleasant features of the connection may as far as possible be increased, it is very desirable that the Commissioner should know you all personally and that, personally, he should know your wishes. . . . Having paid that amount of money [revenue] you are entitled to expect that such restrictions only shall be imposed upon you as are necessary to enable the Government to secure the regular revenue. . . . You are all business men, engaged in a lawful business and entitled to pursue that business untrammeled by any regulation of the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, except in so far as may be necessary for the purpose of collecting the revenue. . . . If there be any regulations or anything whatever pertaining to the office which you may deem unreasonable or unnecessary, I beg that you will not hesitate to express your views."

Such expressions as these make it clear that the United States Government has been uniformly engaged, since the earliest days of the present Internal Revenue system, in fostering the brewing "industry." At many of the National Brewers' Conventions the most violent and scurrilous attacks were made upon the temperance advocates, the clergy and the women of the land. Moreover, these Conventions frequently adopted formal resolutions assailing the advocates of temperance reform, deliberately avowing selfish political designs and inciting the liquor element to defeat all candidates for office suspected of temperance sympathies.[1] Yet the highest officials of the Internal Revenue Department have repeatedly shown their approval of the Brewers' Association, its purposes and its creed. And in 1889 (Dec. 15) the Department of State addressed to all our Consular officers in Mexico, Central and South America and the West Indies a circular letter, at the instance of "the leading maltsters and brewers of the United States," requesting such information as would enable them to "fully understand the requirements necessary to successful trade in each district."[2]

The Government and the Whiskey Men.—In its relations with the whiskey men the Government has been no less friendly and considerate. The great whiskey frauds of 1873–5, by which (according to Daniel D. Pratt, Commissioner of Internal Revenue[3]) the Treasury was robbed of at least $4,000,000, were made possible by the complicity of high officials.[4] These frauds led to a more

---

[1] See "Non-Partisanship, or, Do Not Take Temperance into Politics," by G. H. Carrow (Philadelphia), pp. 7, 9, 16, 20, 41, 55, 61, 67, 94, 113 and 146.

[2] See the *Voice*, Dec. 25, 1890, and Jan. 8, 1891.

[3] See the "Annual Cyclopædia" for 1875, pp. 665–7.

[4] The frauds of 1873–5 were not exceptional. From the beginning of the Internal Revenue system it has been recognized that the distillers are thoroughly unscrupulous, eager to rob the Government whenever opportunity offers. "If all the various means resorted to by many modern distillers for the accomplishment of their designs upon the revenue and its officers could be truthfully written," says the Internal Revenue report for 1867, p. 20, "the very safety of our institutions might well be questioned." In two fiscal years (1876 and 1877) the Government seized 837.950 gallons of distilled spirits because of violations of the law. After the exposure of the whiskey frauds, and notwithstanding the severe punishment administered to individuals concerned, the lawless spirit of the distillers still gave the Government infinite trouble. The Internal Revenue report for 1883 (p. 17) shows that in the five years 1878–82 4.532 illicit stills were seized and that in making the seizures 23 officers and employes were killed and 53 were wounded.

And the brewers have had their share in the conspiracies. According to the report of the Convention of the United States Brewers' Association for 1865, Mr. Wells, stringent enforcement of the regulations, but the Federal executives have been tenderly regardful of the desires of the whiskey trade in shaping public policy. The reckless overproduction of whiskey in certain years caused a stringency in the market and financially embarrassed the distillers. Other manufacturers would have been expected to adjust their own trade affairs and to suffer the consequences of imprudence. Not so with the whiskey-producers. They demanded that the Government should practically remit taxes, and present them with hundreds of thousands of dollars, by extending that very generous provision of the law which permitted them to keep their whiskey in bonded warehouses for three years without paying taxes.[1] Failing to obtain legislation from Congress, they asked the Secretary of the Treasury to arbitrarily grant the desired relief. Secretary Windom (1881) refused, and for this resolute act he was most bitterly opposed by the whiskey power. But on Jan. 6, 1885, Secretary Hugh McCulloch made a ruling practically extending the period for seven months; and he also sent to Congress a bill providing substantially for an indefinite extension. In doing this he took occasion to say:

> "The manufacture of whiskey is one of the largest and most important branches of domestic industry in the United States, and is at the present time, like other manufacturing interests, greatly suffering from over-production. A legitimate business, from which large revenues are derived, it is not only depressed by overproduction, but by being burdened by heavy taxes, the payment of which, as is the case with no other article, is required within a fixed period whatever may be the condition of the market. . . . Under existing laws the manufacturers or holders of whiskey are compelled to pay a tax amounting to nearly five times its cost on the article before it is withdrawn from the warehouse for consumption, or to export at great expense, to be held in foreign countries until there is a home demand for it, or to be sold in such countries to the prejudice of our public revenues."

The conscienceless and dictatorial lobby by which the distillers, wholesale liquor-dealers and importers are represented at Washington is the power that determines the action of Congress on measures affecting the "trade." *Bonfort's Wine and Spirit Circular* (Oct. 10, 1890) relates that during the debate on the McKinley Tariff bill Senator Plumb proposed amendments largely increasing the duties on wines and spirits, and that the effect of their adoption would have been to decrease the consumption of these articles, increase the amount of capital necessary to carry on the business, and cause a loss to the trade "lightly estimated at $3,000,000 per annum." The Wine and Spirit Traders' Society rallied its forces and brought "pressure" upon the Senators and Representatives in the familiar and brutal fashion; and Congress obediently rejected the amendments.

The Inquiry Bill.—Very instructive is the continued refusal of Congress to permit any national investigation of the results of Prohibitory and license systems and the general aspects and consequences of the drink traffic. Congress ordinarily responds promptly and graciously to appeals for its co-operation from citizens who desire official information touching matters of interest; it has appointed Commissions to inquire into the grasshopper plague, the diseases of cattle, etc. For nearly 20 years it has been petitioned at each session to name a strictly impartial "Commission of Inquiry Concerning the Liquor Traffic." The petitioners have been very moderate in suggesting the powers of the proposed Commission and other details, and have proposed the modest sum of $10,000 as a suitable appropriation.[2] But though the bill has repeatedly passed the Senate it has invariably met defeat in the House of Representatives.[3] For its rejection in the last-mentioned body the Democratic party has been responsible in most instances; and the behavior of Speaker Carlisle, who organized the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic Committee of the House with a view to the suppression of this and other temperance measures, has been especially criticised.

---

officially representing the Internal Revenue office, was present on that occasion and said: "By statistical reports it has been proven that 6,000,000 barrels of beer are brewed annually, while only 2,500,000 paid tax."

[1] The bonded period, up to March 28, 1879, was only one year. But on that date Congress extended it to three years, at the urgent solicitation of the distillers.

[2] See the *Voice*, Jan. 9, 1890.

[3] The Inquiry bill was first introduced in the Senate at the request of Mr. A. M. Powell by Senator Pomeroy of Kansas, Feb. 7, 1872. The next year it was introduced in behalf of the National Temperance Society, and that organization has had it in charge ever since. It was passed by the Senate of the 43d Congress and of each succeeding Congress except the 46th.

OTHER LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE DEVELOPMENTS.

The other important practical requests of the Prohibitionists for national action against the liquor traffic have, almost without exception, been denied both by the legislative and the administrative departments of the Government. National legislation for the District of Columbia and for those Territories which have a predominating white population (except Oklahoma[1]) has never taken a Prohibitory tendency. In all the Territories in question the business of manufacturing and selling liquors would be absolutely unrestricted but for the provisions independently adopted by their local legislative bodies. The licensing of saloons in them has been regarded with complete indifference by the Federal authorities. The first law enacted (in 1787) by the Governor and Judges of the great Northwest Territory (from which five powerful States have grown) was a liquor license law. In 1889, when North and South Dakota were admitted as States, the most remarkable features of their Constitutions were articles (adopted by majority votes of the people) prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquor for beverage purposes; but the President, in his formal message to Congress alluding to the entrance of the new States, made no mention of the Prohibitory articles. Bills providing for Local Option in the Territories have been introduced in Congress but defeated in all cases.

In the *District of Columbia*, the seat of the Government, which is under the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress, the liquor laws are feebler than in most American cities. They are administered by a Board of District Commissioners, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The maximum annual license fee is only about $100. The consent of a majority of the property-owners and householders of both sides of the block in which the saloon is to be located must be obtained before license can issue. No license can be granted for a place within 400 feet of a public school; or to any person convicted of selling liquor to an intoxicated person, confirmed drunkard, soldier or volunteer,[2] or minor, or on Sunday, or between midnight and 4 A.M.; or to anyone whose premises have been used for gambling or prostitution; or to any woman; or to a keeper of a grocery or provision store; or for any neighborhood occupied largely by private residences; or "where there are, in the opinion of the Commissioners, more such places than the accommodation of the public warrants." These and some other restrictions are worth little. The annual cost of the police force in Washington is about $600,000. In 1889 there were 21,150 arrests for all offenses, of which 7,642 were for intoxication, disorderly conduct and habitual drunkenness.[3] In the last 10 years the number of liquor licenses (retail and wholesale) granted in Washington has ranged from 900 to 1,400. Attempts have been made in Congress to pass stricter liquor laws for the District of Columbia, and to permit the people of the District to vote on the question of Prohibition, but all have been unsuccessful.

In dealing, however, with certain phases of the drink problem, the Government has not infrequently exhibited progressiveness and has given the strongest indorsement to underlying principles of the temperance reformation. We briefly notice below the more important of these encouraging performances.

Indians (see also pp. 245–6, 277 and 295).—An act of 1802 authorized the President to take such steps as might to him seem expedient to restrain or prevent the distribution or vending of spirits among the Indian tribes. In 1815 it was enacted that anyone establishing a still in the Indian country should be fined $500 and forfeit the still (half to the informer). In 1822 the President was empowered to direct Indian Agents, Governors of Territories and military officers, to search the stores of Indian traders for spirits, and, if any were found, to confiscate them and revoke the trader's license. In 1834 the selling or disposing of spirituous liquor or wine to Indians in the Indian country was punished by fine of $500; introducing spirits or wine into the Indian country, by fine of $300; setting up a still, $1,000; and any person in the employ of the United States, or any Indian, was authorized to destroy liquors found, except military supplies. In 1862 the penalty for selling, bartering, giving or introducing was decreed to be a fine of not more than $300 and imprisonment not longer than two years.

---

[1] Oklahoma lies entirely within the Indian Territory. The Government prohibited liquor within the "Indian country," and when Oklahoma was erected that prohibition naturally applied to it, since the new region could not be reached without crossing the "Indian country." But the Commissioner of Internal Revenue (1889) made an effort to suspend the law. for the especial benefit of the men who desired to sell liquor in Oklahoma. His course was overruled by the Attorney-General. (See the *Voice*, April 25, 1889.)

[2] The sale to soldiers and volunteers in the District of Columbia was prohibited by act of Congress, July 14, 1862.

[3] For a diagram showing the saloons of Washington City, see the *Voice*, July 24, 1890.

Scientific Temperance Instruction.—An act providing for instruction in the schools of the District of Columbia and Territories, the Military and Naval Academies, and all other schools under Government control, concerning the nature and effects of alcoholic liquors, was passed by Congress in 1886 and signed by the President.

Army and Navy.—The regulations concerning the sale and use of intoxicants in the army and navy have undergone a marked change.

An act of the Continental Congress, Nov. 4, 1775, directed that there should be issued daily to each soldier a pint of milk and a quart of spruce beer or cider, but no spirit ration was prescribed. April 30, 1790, it was enacted that every man should have half a gill of rum, brandy or whiskey daily. In 1794 the President was authorized to increase the quantity to a gill for troops on the frontiers. In 1795 a uniform ration of half a gill was ordered. In 1799 commanding officers were given discretionary powers, the ration to be, as before, half a gill. In 1802 this was increased to a gill. In 1804 it was provided that an equivalent of malt liquors or wine might be substituted for spirits at such seasons of the year as, in the opinion of the President, it might be desirable to make the change, in order to promote the health of the soldiers. In 1812 a gill of rum, whiskey or brandy was made a part of the regular daily ration. In 1818 power was given the President to make such changes in the component parts of the ration[1] as he should think for the best, with due regard for health, comfort and economy. In 1832 soldiers were given the right to draw, instead of the spirit ration, coffee and sugar; and in 1838, coffee and sugar, or the money equivalent. An act of 1861 allowed a gill of whiskey daily to each man in cases of excessive fatigue and exposure, but in 1865 the ration was discontinued and it was ordered that the supply on hand should be sold. In 1881 (Feb. 22) President Hayes issued an order prohibiting "the sale of intoxicating liquors at military posts and stations."[2] This order was for the government of post-traders, or private vendors; and it is still in force, strengthened by the added provision (Sept. 27, 1889) that post-traders may sell beer and wine only "in unbroken packages to officers and to canteens." In 1889 (Feb. 1), by direction of the Secretary of War, the sale and use of ardent spirits in canteens at military posts where there were no post-traders were strictly prohibited; but authority was given to permit the sale of wines and light beer by the drink, on week days only, in a room used for no other purpose, provided the commanding officer were satisfied that this permission would tend to prevent the men from resorting to strong intoxicants in places outside army lines, and would promote temperance and discipline among them; but it was ordered that "treating should be discouraged under all circumstances;" and in States or communities where local laws prohibited the liquor traffic, civilians living under such laws were not to be allowed to visit the canteens for the purpose of obtaining beer or wine. By an order issued May 1, 1890, the Secretary of War directed that the foregoing provisions as to canteens should be retained, except that no ardent spirits or wine should be sold in canteens, sales of "light beer" only being tolerated.

In the navy[3] the act of 1794 provided that a half-pint of spirits or a quart of beer should be a constituent of a daily ration. The act of 1801 did not authorize the alternative beer ration. In 1842 the ration was to be a gill of spirits, but persons under 21 were not permitted to draw the spirit ration; and half a pint of wine might be given instead by way of variety; and butter, cheese, raisins, dried fruit, pickles or molasses might be substituted; and sailors might take the value in money. In 1861 the ration was made a gill of spirits, with the right to draw half a pint of wine, or provisions, or money instead. In 1862 (Sept. 1) an act was passed declaring that the spirit ration in the navy should cease forever, and that no spirits should be admitted on board vessels of war except as medical stores; and in lieu of the ration five cents per day was added to the pay of each sailor. This is still the law. Post-traders at navy-yards are not permitted to sell or keep spirits.

---

[1] In this year John C. Calhoun, Secretary of War, in a report to Congress (Dec. 15, 1818), recommended that the spirit ration in the army, as a regular issue, be dispensed with, declaring that it was "destructive alike to the health and moral and physical energy of the soldier."

[2] Construed to apply only to spirituous liquors.

[3] "Grog ration" was the name by which the spirit ration in the navy was called. The word "grog" (meaning spirits mixed with water) was coined by the sailors under the British Admiral Vernon in the 18th Century. The Admiral wore a grogram cloak. He required the sailors to dilute their rum, and the nickname, "Old Grog" was transferred to the weakened beverage.

Thus the Government, after many experiments and solely to improve the physical welfare of the nation's defenders, has prohibited spirituous liquors both in the army and the navy. Even wine is now forbidden in the canteens, and post-traders are ordered not to sell either beer or wine to private soldiers. There is a manifest tendency towards the prohibition of beer in the canteens; any commanding officer may prohibit it if he desires; it is under no circumstances to be sold on Sundays; it is not, as in the old days, given to the soldier as a part of his daily allowance, but must be bought by him if he insists on indulging in it; and the restricted sale is tolerated only on the supposition that if the soldiers cannot get beer within the lines they will drink spirits outside.

The African Rum Trade, etc.—While the Government prohibits, under severe penalties, the sale of liquor to the aborigines of this country and Alaska, it has not made a consistent record in its negotiations with other powers touching the international liquor traffic with native races. Its general disposition at present is undeniably in favor of joining with other nations to prohibit that traffic when occasion is presented. But its past action has been marred by the deliberate refusal of Secretary of State Bayard, in the Cleveland Administration, to co-operate with England and other countries in a Prohibitory arrangement respecting alcoholic liquors, arms, ammunition and dynamite for the Pacific Islands. Replying to proposals from the British Government, April 11, 1885, Secretary Bayard wrote:

> "While recognizing and highly approving the moral force and general propriety of the proposed regulations and the responsibility of conducting such traffic under proper and careful restrictions, the Government of the United States does not feel entirely prepared to join in the international understanding proposed, and will, therefore, for the present, restrain its action to the employment, in the direction outlined by the suggested arrangement, of a sound discretion in permitting traffic between its own citizens in the articles referred to and the natives of the Western Pacific islands."[1]

The formal effort of the State Department in the present (Harrison) Administration to extend the American market for beer in Mexico, Central and South America—in countries having a very large uncivilized population—is another instance of hostility to philanthropic and Christian sentiment. (See p. 639.)

Individual citizens of the United States—heartless men who care not what consequences may come from their acts if the results are pecuniarily profitable—have shipped and are shipping much of the atrocious liquor that is so destructive to the savages of Africa. But the representatives of the Government, both in the Berlin Conference of 1884 and the Brussels Conference of 1890, warmly supported the Prohibitory measures that were proposed. Alluding to the legislation of the Brussels Conference, William F. Wharton, Assistant Secretary of State, in a letter to the editor of this work, Dec. 15, 1890, says: "The attitude of the American Government has been one of pronounced hostility to the liquor traffic, which is believed to be the most powerful factor in making African slavery possible because furnishing the means of barter and of brutalizing the natives so that their enslavement becomes the easier. The repressive provisions adopted fall far short of those proposed by the delegates of the United States." And a stringent Prohibitory act for the Samoan Islands has been adopted by the joint consent of the United States, Great Britain and Germany. (See footnote, pp. 497–8.)

---

[1] The London *Times*, commenting on the failure of the undertaking, said:

"France gave her adherence almost immediately, on condition of the consent of the other Powers. At Berlin the proposal seems to have been pigeon-holed; at all events no answer was received. . . . The United States must, *jointly with Germany*, bear the responsibility of allowing this disgraceful traffic to continue."

Miscellaneous.—The ultimate national aim of the temperance people is to secure a Prohibitory Amendment to the Federal Constitution. The first preparatory step was taken in 1876, when a joint resolution providing for the submission of such an Amendment to the States was introduced in Congress. The demand for submission has been urged in recent years with considerable earnestness in both Houses. The Senate Committee, in highly impressive language, has reported it favorably, and even the House Committee rendered a favorable report early in 1891. These concessions, though of little or no practical value, indicate a growing recognition of the issue in both branches of Congress. (See pp. 439–42.)

The Government's tacit admission of the soundness of fundamental anti-liquor principles is further indicated by the rules of Congress prohibiting the sale of intoxicants in the restaurants of the Senate and House, and throughout the Capitol building. Similar rules are in force for the various Department edifices and for the Government buildings in all parts of the country.

The highest officers of the United States have frequently borne witness to the evils of the drink habit and traffic. The declaration signed by 12 Presidents (see p. 147) is but a slight indication of the views which the most eminent of men unequivocally express when the occasion is one of moral reflection and not of political expediency. Numbered among the Presidents who (either in private or in public life) have emphatically given encouragement to the radical creed, or denounced the saloon in memorable words, are Lincoln (pp. 367–71), Hayes and Benjamin Harrison;[1] and among the Vice-Presidents, Hamlin, Colfax and Wilson (p. 650). The most intense of Prohibitionists would find it difficult to arraign the liquor traffic in more solemn or bitter terms than those employed by the late Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. William Windom.[2] Not all of these men have been entirely committed to the Prohibition policy, and their official acts, guided by untoward conditions, have not been for aggression against the traffic as a whole; but the sentiments that they and scores of other leading statesmen have so weightily expressed show that the temperance agitation, judged strictly by the merits of its underlying principles and essential purposes, is cordially approved by the most responsible and most conservative men of affairs. When a President of the United States not only banishes intoxicants from his private table but refrains from serving them at State dinners and receptions (see pp. 203–4); when the wife[3] of another President, noted for his antagonism to Prohibition, resolutely rejects all alcoholic beverages on public occasions; when the families of the most prominent officials at Washington set the fashion of refusing wine to guests on New Year day, it cannot be doubted that the reform is steadily winning its way in the highest places. On the other hand there are many evidences that pro-liquor opinion and easy social practices still have a powerful hold upon numerous persons influential in public life. The procurement of a bar-room license for a hotel owned by the present Vice-President, Levi P. Morton, was a painful surprise to the country.[4] The disgraceful orgies at many balls and banquets given under public auspices or to commemorate important events,[5] and the expenditure of large sums of money for liquors at celebrations and even at public funerals,[6] are examples of the continued and widespread prevalence of a callous disposition.

THE SUPREME COURT—THE GOVERNMENT AND THE STATES.

Legislative and administrative action, and individual performances and opinion, both friendly and hostile, are determined to a great extent by political circumstances, by prejudice and by influence. However disinterested these are in motive or positive in results, their tendency, at any given time, cannot be regarded by impartial students as decisive or even as necessarily just. The question whether Prohibition is righteous and sound, and may properly be inaugurated by a great Government, will be most satisfactorily answered if considered by a tribunal removed from all the associations that sway parties, Legislatures and individuals, and invested with the solemn obligation to discriminate between conflicting views. Such a tribunal is the Supreme Court of the United States, recognized throughout the world as one of the noblest judicial bodies ever created. Though many have suspected that the Supreme Court's decision in one memorable case was the culmination of a process of selection carefully exercised by the pro-slavery Presidents in appointing the Judges, no taint of corruption has ever been imputed to this bench. At the present day its opinion on any vexed question is accepted as the calmest opinion that can be commanded; and while some may believe that the conditions of law or custom which shape the opinion ought to be changed, few venture to seriously criticise the interpretation unless there is serious difference of opinion in the Court itself. Chosen from among the most mature and conservative men of the country, it cannot be supposed that the Judges have any partisan predisposition to enthusiastic ideas or to reform movements as such.

---

[1] In his speech at Danville, Ind., in 1886, noticed on p. 593, President (then Senator) Harrison, while opposing State Prohibition declared with considerable vigor against the interference of the liquor-sellers in politics.

[2] For speeches delivered by Mr. Windom while in private life, see the *Voice*, Sept. 30, 1886, and the New York *Independent*, July 7, 1887. See also the *Voice*, March 14, 1889.

[3] Mrs. Cleveland.

[4] See the *Voice*, Nov. 14 and Dec. 12, 1889, and Jan. 22, 1891.

[5] Notably the ball in New York City at the Centennial of Washington's inauguration. (See the *Voice*, May 9, 1889.)

[6] Particularly the Yorktown celebration and the Garfield funeral.

The decisions of the Supreme Court on the validity of Prohibitory laws, covering a period of nearly 45 years, uniformly affirm not only the soundness but also the righteousness of all the elementary principles and provisions involved. In 1847, under Chief-Justice Taney, it was unanimously held, in the "License Cases," that certain New England statutes were not in conflict with the Constitution of the United States. The following are extracts from the written opinions of individual Justices in these cases:

Chief-Justice Taney:—"If any State deems the retail and internal traffic in ardent spirits injurious to its citizens and calculated to produce idleness, vice or debauchery, I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States to prevent it from regulating and restraining the traffic, or from prohibiting it altogether, if it thinks proper."

Justice McLean:—"The acknowledged police power of a State extends often to the destruction of property. A nuisance may be abated. Everything prejudicial to the health or morals of a city may be removed."

Justice Grier:—"It is not necessary, for the sake of justifying the State legislation now under consideration, to array the appalling statistics of misery, pauperism and crime which have their origin in the use or abuse of ardent spirits. The police power, which is exclusively in the States, is alone competent to the correction of these great evils, and all measures of restraint or prohibition necessary to effect the purpose are within the scope of that authority. . . . If a loss of revenue should accrue to the United States from a diminished consumption of ardent spirits, she will be the gainer a thousand-fold in the health, wealth and happiness of the people."

As the provisions for the enforcement of State Prohibition became more radical, the Court was asked to determine the limitations of the powers that the States possessed. The broad ground was taken by the liquor men that they, as tradespeople, were unwarrantably interfered with by enactments directing the confiscation of their property without compensation, and making them liable to criminal penalties; for they argued that they were entitled to the protection of the Federal authorities under the terms of the 14th Amendment, which declares that no State shall "deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law." Indications of the final attitude of the Court were afforded when, in the case of Bartemeyer v. Iowa, it said that "so far as such a right [to sell intoxicating liquor] exists, it is not one of the rights growing out of citizenship of the United States;" and when it made the no less significant assertion, in the case of Stone v. Mississippi, that "No Legislature can bargain away the public health or the public morals. The people themselves cannot do it, much less their servants. Government is organized with a view to their preservation and cannot divest itself of the power to provide for them."

The unqualified right of a State to prohibit the liquor business without compensation, to summarily punish violators without jury trials, and even to prevent the manufacture of liquor for one's own use, was sustained (only one of the eight Justices dissenting) in the famous "Kansas Cases" of 1887. (See pp. 92–4, 249–51.) The privileges of the States were enlarged by the decision, in Kidd v. Pearson, that the manufacture of liquor, though intended exclusively for sale in another

State, might be suppressed. Finally, in the Christiansen case (1890), the general principle that liquor-dealers could have no redress, on grounds of right, in consequence of the prohibition of their business or refusal of licenses, was elaborately restated in exceedingly strong language, all the nine Justices assenting. (See pp. 472–3.)

But the authority assumed by the Prohibition States to forbid the importation into their territory of liquor from other States and from foreign countries, and the sale of such liquor in the original packages, has not been sustained by the Supreme Court. It was held in Bowman v. Railway Company (1888) that Iowa could not exclude liquor shipped from Illinois, and in Leisy v. Hardin (1890) that even after the delivery of Illinois liquor at its Iowa destination the local authorities could not disturb persons disposing of it in the unbroken original parcels. These decisions were based on the constitutional ground that Congress alone has power to regulate commerce between the States and with other countries, although it was intimated that Congress might by statute permit separate States to keep out such articles of commerce as are declared contraband by their laws. Yet there was a wide divergence of view in the Supreme Court. In the Bowman case three of the nine Justices dissented (Chief-Justice Waite and Justices Harlan and Gray), and one (Lamar) took no part. In the Leisy case Justice Gray delivered an extended dissenting opinion (joined in by Justices Harlan and Brewer), in which he maintained that the law as already laid down by the Court (notably in the "License Cases") gave the States undoubted power to suppress the "original package" traffic. The action of the majority excited warm discussion throughout the country, and many eminent lawyers expressed the belief not only that the Court had erred but that it would reverse its decision when future opportunity should enable it to review its conclusions. The immediate effect was great confusion in the Prohibition States; numerous original package houses (or "Supreme Court saloons," as they were known in some places) were opened, and the laws were set at naught. In August, 1890, Congress, unable to resist the demand for justice to the States, passed the Wilson bill, removing from the States the disabilities imposed by the Leisy decision.

[The reader who desires to know the records made by the Republican and Democratic parties, respectively, in legislating or failing to legislate upon the national aspects of the liquor issue, and in administering the executive departments of the Government, will be able, knowing the years in which each party has been in power, to ascertain the chief facts from the dates and other particulars given in this article wherever important acts are noticed.]

Universalists.—The General Convention of the Universalists, held in Lynn, Mass., October, 1889, and representing nearly 1,000 parishes, adopted the following:

"RESOLVED, That the Universalists of America, in Convention assembled, reaffirm their conviction that total abstinence for the individual and Prohibition of the traffic in intoxicants by the States, are the only wise methods of dealing with the drink problem. We call upon all men to beware of the delusion of fancied safety in moderate drinking; we call upon the Christian Church in all its branches to be faithful in dealing with this unmitigated evil; we call upon all American citizens to demand of the political party with which they may be in sympathy, fidelity to the highest interests of the State and Nation through sincere and untiring efforts for outlawing the traffic in intoxicating beverages."

Utah.—See Index.

Vermont.—See Index.

Vinous Fermentation.—See FERMENTATION.

Vinous Liquors are those alcoholic drinks resulting from the vinous fermentation (see pp. 174–5) of vegetable sacchariferous juices other than grain, grain ferments being known by the distinctive name of malt liquors (see pp. 412–14). Specifically, vinous liquors are wines from grapes; but kindred articles, prepared from apples, currants, gooseberries, the saps of trees, etc., may conveniently be classified with them. The art of obtaining such beverages has been practiced from the dawn of history.

WINES FROM GRAPES.

Although the grape-vine (genus name, *vitis*) has more than 200 known species, only five or six species are of much commercial importance. These, however, are subdivided into numerous varieties. In the natural process of manufacture the grapes are crushed and pressed, and the juice (called *must*) is kept in tubs or vats until fermentation is completed, when the product is drawn off into barrels. Fermentation is commonly hastened by the addition of beer-yeast. The quality of the wine is affected by the temperature at which fermentation takes place; when at a high temperature the product will be richer in alcohol but poorer in bouquet, and *vice versa*. After the storage of the wine in barrels a second and slow fermentation begins, continuing sometimes for several months, and when this is finished it is *racked off* into fresh casks. Isinglass and other gelatinous substances are introduced to act on the tannin and clarify the liquor; this process is called *fining*. Various methods of *improving* (to increase the quantity or alter the quality) are in vogue—especially *chaptalization* (much employed in the manufacture of Burgundy), by which an excess of acidity is neutralized by adding marble dust, and the quantity and alcoholic strength are increased by means of cane or starch sugar; *gallization*, a method of increasing the quantity by the infusion of sugar, acid and water, and *petiotization* or refermenting of the *marc* or refuse of grape-skins, seeds, etc., with a solution of sugar and water. The chemical constituents of 36 specimens of domestic wines analyzed by the United States Agricultural Department, are averaged in the following table:

CONSTITUENTS.	AVERAGE PER CENT. OF CONSTITUENTS.		
	16 Samples Red Wines.	9 Samples White Wines.	11 Samples Sweet Wines.
Specific gravity........	.9946	.9912	1.0261
Alcohol (by weight), %	9.66	10.44	14.50
" (" volume) "	11.95	12.94	17.85
Extract	1.94	1.35	11.21
Tot. acids, as tartaric...	.611	.665	.511
Fixed acids, as tartaric	.397	.49	.37
Volatile " " acetic..	.168	.131	.104
Bitartrate of potash	.068	.152	.067
Reducing sugars as dextrose	.164	.250	8.48
Glycerine	.490	.528	.260
Ash	.290	220	.351

The alcoholic strength of wines is seldom the result of natural fermentation. It is imparted by *fortification*, or the addition of distilled spirits. Fortifying is now carried on in all countries without disguise. It is done on so extensive a scale by the California wine-makers that for their benefit a special act has been passed by Congress permitting them to use grape-spirits in their business without paying the Internal Revenue tax on the quantities so used. (See p. 637.) The universal practice of adulterating wines with cheap and dangerous substances is discussed on pp. 7–9. "Wine, so-called," says George Walker, former Consul-General of the United States to France, "is also entirely made of other substances than the grape, and therefore an article is often sold in the markets which does not contain any true wine. . . . . In order to correct the acidity of wine some unscrupulous dealers make use of litharge. The result is, the persons who use their wines are often subject to gripes or colic, such as afflict painters."[1] Statements like these, sustained by abundant shocking details, are made by candid and competent observers without number. The stupendous frauds perpetrated by the French vintners are indicated by the fact that in 1887, as compared with 1875, the quantity of cheap Spanish and other wines imported into France and used for "doctoring" purposes had increased 64 times. (See p. 479.) *Plastering* is one of the peculiar and most reprehensible of French methods of adulteration; it is done by adding considerable quantities of lime, gypsum or alum, to heighten the color of the wine and to clarify it by reducing the lees or dregs. "The ability to 'doctor' and falsify wines," says the United States Agricultural report for 1880 (pp. 170–3), "is not lacking in this country, . . . and these practices are in reality abetted by the lack of knowledge and the depraved taste of the public which demands strongly alcoholic or very sweet wines. . . . The so-called American ports and sherries are not to be commended, for many of them seem to have been made by bunglers whose sole object seems to have been to use the cheapest sugar or molasses and the poorest and cheapest form of alcohol, brandy or whiskey. . . . So soon as the professional improver is allowed to use his peculiar methods and formulas there is no longer any safety."

The percentages of alcohol in wines vary widely. The following table, including some of the best-known European wines, compiled in part from Girardin's "Chimie appliquée aux Arts industriels" (5th ed.), and in part from König's "Nährungs- und Genussmittel" (1880), is taken from the United States Dispensatory for 1887:

WINES.	PERCENTAGES OF ALCOHOL.		PER-CENTAGES OF SUGAR.
	By Volume.	By Weight.	
Lisa (G.)......................	23.47	....	....
Madeira, 1870 (K.)............	19.11	15 54	....
" 1868 (K.)............	18.81	15.34	....
Sherry, 1870 (K.).............	22.90	18.66	....
" Amontillado, 1870 (K.)	20.06	16.34	....
Port, white 1860 (K.).........	20.03	16.28	....
" red, 1863 (K.)...........	19.46	15.82	....
" red, 1865 (K.)...........	21.91	17.93	....
Marsala (Ingham) (K.)........	20.44	16.73	....
" (Woodhouse) (K.).......	19.09	15.52	....
Malaga, 1872 (K.)............	16.14	13.23	16 57
Muscat wine, 1872 (K.).......	12.35	10.02	15.52
Tokay, 1868 (K.)..............	12.13	9.80	22.11
" (Ausbruch), 1866 (K.)....	12.74	10.29	14.99
Ruster (Ausbruch), 1872 (K.)..	11.08	8.96	21.74
Samos wine, 1872 (K.)........	13.55	10.97	11.82
Champagne (Carte Blanche) (K.)...............	11.75	9.51	11.53
Champagne (not effervescing) (G.)...................	12.69	....	....
Hock (effervescing) (K.)......	12.14	9.80	8.49
Sherry (Lachrymæ Christi)(G.)	17.00	....	....
Moselle wine (K.)............	12.06	....	....
Rhine wine (Hesse), red (K.).	9.55	....	....
" " " white (K.)	11.07	....	....
German wine (Riesling) (K.).	11.30	....	....
" " (Traminer) (K.)	11.80	....	....
" " (Gutedel) (K.)..	10.30	....	....
Claret (Saint Estèphe) (G.)...	9.70	....	....
" (Château-Latour) (G.).	9.30	....	....
" (Château-Lafite) (G.)..	8.77	....	....
" (Château-Margaux)(G.)	8.07	....	....
Chablis, white (G.)..........	7.33	....	....

The kinds of wine are innumerable, special characteristics of composition, color, flavor, quality, etc., depending on differences in the varieties of the grape and differences of soil, climate, modes of cultivation, methods of preparation, etc. Among the leading classes are red, white, spirituous, light, sparkling, still, dry, sweet, rough and acidulous wines.

---

[1] Consular reports, vol. 6, p. 562.

Red wines are derived from dark-colored grapes fermented with the "marc," *i.e.*, skins and seeds.

White wines are made either from white grapes with or without the skins, or from the juice of dark grapes. The dark skins contain coloring matter, which, however, is not soluble in water, and hence the unfermented juice is not charged with it; but when fermentation occurs, the coloring particles are broken up by the alcohol and distributed throughout the liquid, giving the dark hue.

A *spirituous* or *generous* wine is the product of a grape-juice containing a large proportion of sugar-principle, subjected to sufficient fermentation to convert it into an alcohol, producing a wine with a considerable percentage of spirit. To secure a spirituous wine by natural processes a very sweet grape is required, but it is often artificially obtained by adding to the sugar the ferment of an ordinary must.

A *light wine* is one relatively weak in alcohol, produced from a must having little sugar.

Sparkling or *effervescing* wines are those impregnated with carbonic acid gas. Champagnes are the principal beverages of this class. They are made by bottling the liquor before the second fermentation has been completed. The bottles, being carefully sealed, retain the gas that is generated.

Still wines include all the wines that do not effervesce,—*i.e.*, all wines in which the fermentation has been finished before they are sealed or consumed.

Dry wines are sound and strong-bodied, without marked sweetness or excessive acidity.

Sweet wines are such as are produced from juice containing a great deal of sugar with too little ferment present to convert all the sugar into alcohol. Wines of this kind must be fortified with spirits, for there is danger that the sugar, especially upon exposure, will undergo acetous fermentation.

Rough or *astringent* wines are those having a strong flavor of tannic acid derived from the "marc" (skins, stems and seeds) of the grape.

Acidulous wines are characterized by the presence of carbonic acid or an unusual quantity of tartar.

The United States Pharmacopœia (1880) recognizes three varieties of medicinal wines—*red wine, white wine* and *stronger white wine.* Besides these, it names certain medicated wines prepared by mixing medicinal agents with white wine. These are: *wine of aloes, wine of antimony, aromatic wine, wine of colchicum root, wine of colchicum seed, wine of ergot, bitter wine of iron, wine of ipecac, wine of opium* and *wine of rhubarb.* As indicated by the names (except in the case of aromatic wine), these medicated articles have for their chief ingredients white wine and the drugs mentioned. The so-called *aromatic wine* of the Pharmacopœia contains equal parts of lavender, origanum, peppermint, rosemary and sage, dissolved in a sufficient quantity of white wine to make 100 parts. The United States Dispensatory (1887, p. 1,530), voicing the best conclusions of science in regard to the habitual beverage use of wine, says:

> "It [wine], in a state of health, is at least useless, if not absolutely pernicious. The degree of mischief which it produces depends on the character of the wine. Thus, the lighter wines of France are comparatively harmless, while the habitual use of the stronger wines, such as sherry, port, madeira, etc., even though taken in moderation, is always injurious, as having a tendency to induce gout, apoplexy and other diseases dependent on plethora and over-stimulation. All wines, however, when used habitually in excess, are productive of bad consequences. They weaken the stomach, produce disease of the liver and give rise to gout, dropsy, apoplexy, tremors and not unfrequently mania."

Without undertaking to present a complete list—which would be well-nigh an impossible task, so many are the names and so difficult is it to get complete information for all countries,—we notice below some of the most important wines of this day:

Algerian wines have acquired prominence since the phylloxera began its devastations in Europe. They are full-bodied and tolerably strong in alcohol.

Bordeaux wines, taking their name from the French city of Bordeaux, are produced in the Médoc district and are otherwise called médoc and clarets.

Burgundy wines, the richly-flavored products of the Province of Burgundy, are, after the médoc, the best-known red wines of France; they include several varieties of white wines.

California wines embrace many kinds, resembling the European products but coarser in quality. Some go by the old names—hock, muscatel, claret, sherry, port, burgundy, moselle, sauterne, tokay, malaga, frontignan, etc. Others are *mission wines, riesling, riesling hock, zinfandel, angelica, beaune, berger, charbona, lenoire, gutedel, St. Macaire* and *sonoma.* The vine was first cultivated in California in 1769 by Catholic priests from Mexico.

Other American Wines.—Among the most important are the *catawbas* (still, sparkling and sweet), *delaware, concord, ives seedling, Virginia seedling and scuppernong.* Some so-called champagnes are made. A great many more might be named, but they are mostly unknown beyond the localities where they are produced. There are wine-growing districts along the shores of Lake Erie in Ohio, around Lake Keuka and in other parts of New York, in Missouri, in Texas, in Virginia and in several other States. But their interests are insignificant compared with those of California.

Cape wine is a general name for the wines of South Africa.

Carlowitz (Hungarian) resembles port, but is more astringent and is without the fruity flavor.

Cette wines are inferior grades of sherries, or are similar wines made in parts of Spain outside the sherry district.

Chablis is a white French wine of fair quality, named for the Commune of Chablis, where it is grown.

Champagne, the chief of the effervescing wines, was originally made in the Province of Champagne, France. Several varieties, both still and sparkling, are properly classed under this name but in the United States the word champagne is applied exclusively to the effervescent article. Sparkling champagnes are produced from both white and red grapes, carefully pressed, and are of an amber color which becomes darker when a large proportion of red grapes is used. The Departments of Marne and Haute-Marne, in France, are the principal sources.

Claret (old English, from the Latin *clarus*, clear) is the name first given in England to the red wines of the Médoc district of France, and later applied to all the red Bordeaux wines and to similar ones produced in the United States. Claret is of a deep purple color. Good claret has a delicate flavor, somewhat acid and astringent.

Constantia is a superior Cape wine.

Dalmatian wines, products of Dalmatia, a Province of Austria-Hungary, are red for the most part, having a full color and much alcohol, and resembling the wines of Burgundy. The leading varieties are *moscato roso, vino tartaro, prosecco vugora, maraschino* and *malvasia.*

Frontignan or *frontignac* is a sweet muscadine wine, made from frontignan grapes in the vicinity of the small town of Frontignan in southern France.

Hermitage (French, *vin de l'hermitage*) is a celebrated French wine, both white and red, of the Department of the Drôme.

Hock or *hochheimer* (from Hochheim, Germany) is a Rhenish wine, light and yellowish. Some kinds are sparkling, others are still.

Lachrymæ Christi (Latin, tears of Christ) when genuine, is regarded as one of the most superior wines of Italy. It is made in comparatively small quantities in the vicinity of Naples.

Lisbon, one of the chief Portuguese wines, is sweet and of a light color.

Mâcon (French), made near the town of that name, resembles burgundy, though lighter in color and body and of inferior quality.

Madeira, the strongest of the white wines, is a famous product of the Madeira Islands. It has had a high reputation since the middle of the 18th Century, but very little now sold as madeira is genuine. The choicest kinds are *malmsey*, formerly made by the Jesuits in the vineyards at Cama de Lobos from grapes that ripen a month later than most others, *sercial*, a full-bodied and very fine wine, from the riesling grape, and *bual*, another rich variety. *Tinta* is a red madeira.

Malaga, a sweet wine obtained principally from the Muscat grapes in the Province of Malaga, Spain.

Malmsey, from Crete, Spain, the Madeira and Canary Islands, is a sweet wine of high grade. Like most of the other famous beverages it is now made on a very limited scale.

Marsala, the principal wine of Sicily, from the town of Marsala. It is like maderia in bouquet and greatly improves with age.

Médoc is a name of extensive application, covering the numerous wines of the Médoc district, the chief center of the French wine industry; most frequently given to the red clarets. There are, however, various white médocs, including the *semillon*, *sauvignon* and *muscatelle*.

Moselle, from the banks of the river Moselle (Germany), is one of the most prominent of the lighter wines. Most moselles are white.

Muscatels include several lucious sweet wines of Italy, Spain and France.

Port or *oporto*, for a century and a half the most valued of Portuguese wines, has a deep purple color, is moderately sweet and somewhat astringent, and is one of the strongest of vinous liquors. The only genuine port comes from a small district (the Alto Douro) in Portugal, which the phylloxera has ravaged in recent years. (See pp. 493-4.) Yet enormous quantities of so-called port are consumed. *English port* is a spurious article.

Rhenish or *Rhine* wines, strictly speaking, are those made along the Rhine river, but the name is a comprehensive one for most German wines, including hock and moselle. The finest come from the right banks of the river. Among favorite kinds from the left bank are *liebfraumilch*, *nierstein*, *scharlachberg* and *forst*.

Roussillon, a dark, full-bodied wine, from the old Province of Roussillon in southern France, is of high quality and is much used for blending with light thin wines.

Sack (from the French *sec*, meaning dry) was an old name for dry wines of Spain. It is now given to a species of sweet wine.

Saumur, a white sparkling wine produced near the town of Saumur, France. It is considered a good substitute for champagne.

Sauternes, from white grapes grown in the district of Sauterne, France, embrace some of the most popular white wines.

Sec (French for dry) is an affix to names of wines, indicating that they are "dry," as "champagne sec."

Sherry (from Xeres—or Jerez—de la Frontera, a town of Spain) ranks among the favorites of connoisseurs. It is of deep amber color and very strong in alcohol. There are two general classes of sherries—*amontillado* and *manzanilla*. Nearly all so-called sherries are base counterfeits.

Spanish red or *terragona*, comes from Catalonia in Spain, the finest kinds being rich and full-bodied. The supply is very small

Teneriffe, from the Canary island of Teneriffe, resembles madeira, is white in color and is about as strong in alcohol as sherry.

Tent or *tinta*, a deep red wine, is a prominent Spanish variety.

Tokay, from the district surrounding the town of Tokay in Hungary, is one of the best-known of Hungarian wines, sweet and rich.

FERMENTS FROM OTHER FRUITS, ETC.

Of the fermented liquors derived from other fruits than grapes, the most important is *cider*, manufactured from apples in enormous quantities in the United States and other countries. Little attention is given to the development of scientific processes, although several large firms produce the beverage on a great scale and by systematic methods. *Sweet cider* is the newly-expressed and unfermented juice; *hard cider* is the intoxicating product which results from exposure to the air. If the exposure is continued the cider turns to *vinegar*. There is no means of ascertaining the aggregate quantity made in the United States. Thoroughly fermented cider has about 8 per cent. of alcohol. *Perry* is the fermented juice of the pear, popular in England and some other countries, but not so much so in the United States; its alcoholic percentage ranges from 7 to 9. Other ferments, called wines, are made from various small fruits and berries, such as *currants*, *gooseberries*, *blackberries*, *raspberries*, *whortleberries*, *elderberries*, *mulberries*, *cherries*, *strawberries*, *plums*, *red bilberries*, and the like. Oranges are sometimes used for the production of *orange wine*. The saps of trees are converted into fermented drinks, especially noteworthy being the *pulque* of Mexico (see pp. 428-9) and the *palm wine* (called in India *toddee* or *toddy*) of Africa, India and other warm regions. There is scarcely a fruit of the forest, field, orchard or garden that cannot readily be made to provide a fermented drink. The utilization of many of them, however, is impracticable or not regarded as worth the pains, because the ordinary beverages are abundant and cheap, and satisfy all the tastes of the drinker.

Virginia.—See Index.

Washington (State of).—See Index.

Washingtonian Movement.—This celebrated moral suasion crusade had its origin in the reformation of a Baltimore drinking club of six men—W. K. Mitchell, a tailor; J. F. Hoss, a carpenter; David Anderson and George Steers, blacksmiths; James McCurley, a coachmaker, and Archibald Campbell, a silversmith. They were induced to change their habits by the address of a temperance lecturer, and signed the following pledge (April 6, 1840):

> "We, whose names are annexed, desirous of forming a Society for our mutual benefit, and to guard against a practice—a pernicious practice—which is injurious to our health, standing and families, do pledge ourselves, as gentlemen, that we will not drink any spirits or malt liquors, wine or cider."

They took the name of "The Washington Temperance Society," and were familiarly known as "Washingtonians." By the end of 1840 this Baltimore organization had 700 members, and under the leadership of John H. W. Hawkins, the most prominent Washingtonian agitator, the crusade spread to other cities and States. (For particulars, see p. 203.) Its force was spent by 1843, but the energy developed by it was of great and lasting benefit to the general temperance cause. Like all similar undertakings the Washingtonian movement demonstrated that mere moral suasion methods cannot overcome the organized liquor traffic.

Wayland, Francis.—Born in New York City, March 11, 1796; died in Providence, R. I., Sept. 26, 1865. He graduated at Union College in 1813, and began the practice of medicine in Troy, N. Y. But he soon left this profession for the Baptist ministry. He served as tutor in Union College from 1817 to 1821, and as pastor of a Baptist church in Boston for the next five years. In 1827 he was elected President of Brown University, and he filled that position for 28 years. He was a clear and an able writer on philosophic and kindred questions. As early as 1833, before the Father Mathew and Washingtonian movements, and nearly 20 years before the Maine law was enacted, he wrote : "I think the prohibition of the traffic in ardent spirits a fit subject for legislative enactment, and I believe the most happy results would flow from such prohibition." The other references to the temperance question in his writings are strong and radical.

Wesleyan Methodist Church.—The utterances of this church on the drink issue are in all respects extremely radical. The following is from the declarations of the General Conference (representing 22 Annual Conferences), held at La Otto, Ind., in October, 1887:

> "That we hold that law must be an adjunct of moral means in order to suppress the traffic side of this evil. The appetite may be reached through the church and home, but the public traffic must be struck through the law, and back of the law should be a political organization in sympathy with it, and pledged to its enforcement, in order to its efficiency."

Wesley, John.—Born in Epworth, Eng., June 28, 1703; died in London, March 2, 1791. He was the founder of the Methodist societies, a voluminous writer, an extensive traveller, an eloquent preacher and a remarkable organizer and disciplinarian. He was a total abstainer from the beverage use of all intoxicants. Like other early temperance reformers, he was especially severe in condemning distilled spirits. In 1743 he prepared the famous rule of the societies against "drunkenness, buying or selling distilled liquors, or drinking them, except in cases of extreme necessity." (See p. 425.) In 1744, speaking of wine-drinking, he said:

> "You see the wine when it sparkles in the cup, and are going to drink it. I say, there is poison in it, and therefore beg you to throw it away. If you add, 'It is not poison to me, though it may be to others;' then I say, 'throw it away for thy brother's sake, lest thou embolden him to drink also. Why should thy strength occasion thy weak brother to perish, for whom Christ died?'"

In 1760 he arraigned liquor-sellers in these words:

> "All who sell liquors in the common way, to any that will buy, are poisoners-general. They murder His Majesty's subjects by wholesale; neither does their eye pity or spare. They drive them to hell like sheep. And what is their gain ? Is it not the blood of these men? Who, then, would envy their large estates and sumptuous palaces ? A curse is in the midst of them. The curse of God is in their gardens, their groves—a fire that burns to the nethermost hell. Blood, blood is there! The foundation, the floors, walls, the roof, are stained with blood!"

West Virginia.—See Index.

Whiskey.—See SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS.

Wilson, Henry.—Born in Farmington, N. H., Feb. 16, 1812; died in Washington, D. C., Nov. 22, 1875. In his eleventh year he was apprenticed to a farmer. He learned the shoemaker's trade, and it was his means of livelihood for a number of years. He became active in politics about 1840, served in both branches of the Massachusetts Legislature, was President of the State Senate in 1851 and 1852, was a member of the United States Senate from 1855 to 1873, and was elected Vice-President in 1872. He was one of the leaders of Anti-Slavery sentiment, united with the Free-Soilers in 1848 because the Whigs refused to take a friendly attitude, denounced the Fugitive Slave law, and rendered exceedingly valuable services as Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs in the Senate during the Civil War. He was a total abstainer and a pronounced opponent of the drink traffic. In 1867 he was instrumental in reviving the Congressional Temperance Society. His social and public influence, throughout his career at Washington, was uniformly given for the discouragement of drinking customs. "All other issues before the American people," said he, "dwindle into insignificance compared to the issue involved in the temperance question."

Wine.—See VINOUS LIQUORS.

Wisconsin.—See Index.

Woman's Christian Temperance Union.[1]—The largest and most active of the non-secret temperance organizations of the United States. It sprang from the Ohio Woman's Crusade of 1873. At Chautauqua, in August, 1874, Mrs. Mattie McClellan Brown, Mrs. Jennie F. Willing, Mrs. Emily H. Miller and a few other women held a meeting and decided to call a National Convention. This body met at Cleveland, Nov. 17, 1874, and the W. C. T. U. was there organized. It now has branches in every State and Territory, including Alaska, and the total number of paying members (not counting juveniles) is about 150,000. (For facts about the juvenile department, see LOYAL TEMPERANCE LEGION.) The total receipts of the National Union for the year 1890 were about $30,000. The object, as expressed in the original preamble to the plan of work (which, so far as the expression of purpose is concerned, remains unchanged), is to unite the efforts of Christian women for the extinction of intemperance; and this object was more explicitly defined by the second National Convention (Cincinnati, 1875), as follows:

---

[1] The editor is indebted to Miss Frances E. Willard, Mrs. Mary T. Lathrap, Mrs. Mary Clement Leavitt, Mrs. Frances J. Barnes, Alice M. Guernsey, Mrs. Caroline A. Leech and Miss Lucia F. E. Kimball.

> "RESOLVED, That whereas, the object of just government is to conserve the best interests of the governed; and whereas, the liquor traffic is not only a crime against God but subversive of every interest of society; therefore, in behalf of humanity, we call for such legislation as shall secure this end; and while we will continue to employ all moral agencies as indispensable, we hold Prohibition to be essential to the full triumph of this reform."

The following is the pledge of the Union, adopted by the Convention held at Chicago in 1877:

> "I hereby solemnly promise, God helping me, to abstain from all distilled, fermented and malt liquors, including wine, beer and cider, and to employ all proper means to discourage the use of and traffic in the same."

Each member wears as a badge a bit of white ribbon. The motto is, "For God, and Home, and Native Land."

In 1880 the old plan of Committees was replaced by a plan of Departments, and the remarkable success of the Union in so many phases of effort is due in no small measure to the work of the Departments, each of which is in charge of a responsible and energetic woman, with an assistant or assistants. In the report for 1889 this classification of Departments is found:

Organization.—National Organizers, Y Organizers, American Organizers for World's W. C. T. U., Work among Foreign-speaking People, Work among Colored People, Young Women's Work, and Juvenile Work.

Preventive.—Health and Heredity.

Educational.—Scientific Temperance Instruction, Sunday-school Work, Temperance Literature, The Press, Relation of Temperance to Labor and Capital, School of Methods, Presenting Our Cause to Influential Bodies, and Narcotics.

Evangelistic.—Bible Study (including Unfermented Sacramental Wine and Securing a Day of Prayer in the Week of Prayer), Work in Prisons, Jails, Police Stations, Almshouses and Asylums, Work among Railroad Employes, Work among Soldiers and Sailors, Work among Lumbermen, Promotion of Social Purity, and Sabbath Observance.

Social.—Parlor Meetings, Flower Mission, and State and County Fairs.

Legal.—Legislation and Petitions, Franchise, and Peace and International Arbitration.

These Departments do not include various standing committees. The Union also conducts in Chicago a National Temperance Hospital and Training School for Nurses, a Woman's Lecture Bureau, a Woman's Temperance Publication Association, and other enterprises. The headquarters of the organization are in Chicago, where the *Union Signal* (weekly), one of the most prominent and widely-circulated of temperance newspapers, is published. Other periodicals, and many tracts and works, are issued. The chief officers are (1891): President, Miss Frances E. Willard; Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Caroline B. Buell; Recording Secretary, Mrs. Mary A. Woodbridge; Treasurer, Miss Esther Pugh.

The example of the women of the United States gave rise to the National W. C. T. U. of Canada, also an influential organization. The World's W. C. T. U. was conceived in 1883, and now has branches and societies in numerous countries. It owes its development especially to the labors of Mrs. Mary Clement Leavitt, who began a tour of the world in 1883, starting from San Francisco and visiting, successively, the Hawaiian Islands, Australasia, and many nations of Asia, Africa and Europe. Mrs. Leavitt has not yet completed her mission.[1] The first President of the World's Union was the late Margaret Bright Lucas, of England. Miss Willard is now (1891) at the head.

The National Union of the United States has taken a decided stand in favor of the ballot for women, believing that the reform can never be entirely successful until the women, who suffer most from the drink traffic, have power to declare at the ballot-box for its destruction. Founded essentially on the broad principle that Prohibition is indispensable, the Union has naturally shown an active interest in politics, striving for the adoption of Constitutional Amendments and other advanced measures, petitioning Legislatures, Congress and the executives, and seeking to command the friendly action of parties. The principal leaders, with very few exceptions, and an overwhelming majority of the individual members, became convinced that the Prohibition movement required faithful and general partisan championship, and accordingly the following declaration was made at the St. Louis Convention of 1884:

---

[1] For an extended account of her work (written by herself), see the *Voice*, Dec. 18, 1890.

> "We refer to the history of ten years of persistent moral suasion work as fully establishing our claim to be called a non-political society, but one which steadily follows the white banner of Prohibition wherever it may be displayed. We have, however, as individuals, always allied ourselves in local and State political contests with those voters whose efforts and ballots have been given to the removal of the dramshop and its attendant evils; and at this time, while recognizing that our action as a national society is not binding upon States or individuals, we reaffirm the positions taken by the society both at Louisville in 1882, and at Detroit in 1883, pledging our influence to 'that party, by whatever name called, which shall furnish us the best embodiment of Prohibition principles and will most surely protect our homes.' And as we now know which national party gives us the desired embodiment of the principles for which our ten years' labor has been expended, we will continue to lend our influence to the national political organization which declares in its platform for National Prohibition and Home Protection. In this, as in all our progressive effort, we will endeavor to meet argument with argument, misjudgment with patience, denunciation with kindness, and all our difficulties and dangers with prayer."

The attitude thus taken has been adhered to despite the vigorous opposition of an element of dissenters; and its practical effect has been to give the influence of the Union to the Prohibition party. Notwithstanding this, the national organization holds itself in readiness to indorse any other political party so soon as creed and performances may justify indorsement.

The element that objects to the political attitute of the W. C. T. U. has cut adrift from the parent body and set up a distinct society, called the "Non-Partisan Woman's Christian Temperance Union." It was founded in 1890, chiefly through the efforts of Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, with the support of the Iowa State Union. The President (1891) is Mrs. Ellen J. Phinney of Cleveland; Secretary, Miss Jennie F. Duty, Cleveland. According to the "National Temperance Almanac for 1891," there are general organizations in Maine, Vermont, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Iowa and Minnesota, and the District of Columbia, and local Unions in a number of States not here named.

Woman Suffrage.—See Index.

Wyoming.—See Index.

INDEX.

NOTE.—The cross references in the Index are to Index titles, not necessarily to titles of articles in the body of the book.

Aarrestad, Sven, 456.
Abkari act (India), 242–3.
Abolition and Prohibition movements compared, 30–3.
Absinthe, 617.
— Epilepsy from, 161.
Absolute alcohol, 615–16.
Abstinence (see "Total Abstinence").
Abyssinia, 13.
Acchioc, a Yucatan intoxicant, 430.
Acetic acid, 18.
Acid matters used in adulterating, 8–10.
Acidulous wines, 648.
Acute diseases from drink, 25.
Adair law, The, 334–5.
Adams, John Quincy (President), 147.
Adams, Nehemiah (Rev.), Opposition of to Abolition, 32.
Addison, Joseph, on wine adulterations, 7.
Adulteration, 7–11, 133, 234, 616–17, 647.
— Legislation concerning, 9. (See also digests of State laws, 275–360.)
— Phylloxera's ravages, Effects of upon, 479–82.
Advent Christian Church, 11.
Africa, 11–17.
— Liquor traffic with, 15–17, 240–1, 498 (note), 643.
African Methodist Episcopal Church, 17.
African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, 17.
Agricultural sentiment (see "Farmers").
Aguardiente, a spirituous liquor, 16, 82.
Alabama:
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 382, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 275–7.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 573, 577.
Alaska, Prohibitory law for, 277.
Albucasis, 155.
Alcohol, Amylic, 18, 20, 155.
Alcohol, Butylic, 18, 155.
Alcohol, Ethylic or Common, 17–19, 615.
— Affinity of for water, 20, 154.
— Arts, manufactures, sciences, etc., Quantities of used in the, 18–19, 130–1, 255, 615.
—— Physicians favor restriction of use to, 424.
— Beverage use much in excess of legitimate use, 19, 615 (note).
— Chemical constituents of, 18, 20.
— Decomposition a necessary antecedent to the production of, 18.
— Derivation of the word, 18.
— Distillation of, Process of, 154–5.
— Early distillation of, 18, 155.
— Effects of, 20–6. (See also "Medical Testimony.")
— Fortifying of wines with, 7–9, 12, 14, 481, 614, 647.
— Legitimate uses of, 18, 130, 255.
— Medicinal use of, 420–5, 632 (note).
— "Neither food nor physic," 424.
— Percentages of in liquors, 19, 414, 616, 647.
— Pure, not used as beverage, 19.
—— should be preferred to alcoholic liquors for medicinal purposes, 19 (note), 424.
— Valueless for the purpose of counteracting cold, 82–3; or heat, 83; as a food, 179–80, 632 (note).
Alcohol, Melytic, 20.
Alcohol, Methyl, 18, 20, 616.
Alcohol, Propylic, 18, 155.
Alcoholic diseases, 25.
Aldrich, Wilbur, Article by, 272–360; see also 634 (note).
Ale, 19, 414.
Alexander, James W., on the physiological effects of drink, 408.
Algeria, 12.
Allen, Nathan (Dr.), on the hereditary effects of drink, 236.
Allentown (N. J.), The Sober Society of, 30.
Alliance News, The, 197.
Almshouse-keepers on pauperism and drink, 466–7.
Amendments, Constitutional (see "Constitutional Prohibition").
American Temperance Society, 161, 207, 630.
American wines, 648.
Amoy, 76.
Amylic alcohol, 18, 20, 155.
Anæsthetics used as inebriants, 79–80.
Anarchists, 270–1.
Ancients, Drink among the, 220–32.
— Distillation not known to, 364; except (probably) the Chinese, 72.
Anderson, William G. (Prof.), Article by, 482–3.
Angola, 17.
Anisette, a liqueur, 618.
Anti-License provisions of Constitutions, 98, 106.
Anti-Prohibition, 26–7.
Anti-Saloon Republicans, 27–30.
Antiseptic properties of alcohol, 19.
Anti-Slavery agitation, The:
— and the Prohibition agitation, compared, 30–3.
— the Republican party and, 585–7.
Apothecaries, 159.
— Quantity of spirits sold by, 615 (note).
Appetite, Hereditary transmission of, 204–7, 235–6.
Apple-jack, 617.
Appleton, James, Biographical sketch of, 33–4.
Applications for license, Provisions governing (see the digests of State laws, 275–360).
Aqua vitæ, 18.
Aquinas, St. Thomas, 599.
Arabia, Early distillation of alcohol in, 155.
Arak, a distilled drink of the East, 11, 462.
Arctic voyagers, Experience of, 24, 83, 180, 483.
Ardent spirits, 34. (See "Spirituous Liquors.")
Argentine Republic, 612.
Arguments, Liquor, 401–3.
Aristotle, 221, 230–1.
Arizona:
— Brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 277–8.
Arkansas:
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 382, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 278–9.
— Local Option votes in, 400 (note).
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 577.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.

Armstrong, Libbeus (Rev.), 82.
Armstrong, William H., 99.
Army and Navy (United States), 642–3.
Arnold, Arthur, on drink in Persia, 470.
Arrack, a distilled drink of the East, 74, 618.
Arrests and commitments:
— under High License and low license, 210–11.
——— Prohibition, 505–6, 508–9, 510–12, 517–18, 525–7, 528–37.
——— the Gothenburg system (Christiania), 455.
— (See also the different foreign countries.)
Arthur, Timothy Shay, Biographical sketch of, 34.
Arts, manufactures, sciences, etc., Alcohol used in the, 18–19, 130–1, 255, 615. (For discriminations of the statutes, see "Legislation.")
Ashenhurst, J. O. (Rev.), 12 (note).
Asthenia from alcohol, 25.
Astringency of wines, 648 ; how imitated, 8.
Asylums, Inebriate, 247–8.
Atchison (Kan.), Prohibition in, 511–12.
Atherton, J. M.:
— on High License and Local Option, 218.
——— "Fine" whiskey, The comparative insignificance of the production of, 376–7.
——— the Internal Revenue, 256.
Atkinson, Edward, Estimate by, of the expenditure for drink, 138.
Atlanta, Ga.:
— Local Option contests in, 236, 368, 400.
— Prohibition, Results of in, 534–5, 544–5, 554–6.
Augur, E. P., Statistics prepared by, 526–7.
Austin, Henry W., Biographical sketch of, 34–5.
Australasia, 35–8.
Austria, 38–9.
— Consumption of liquors in, 134.
— Hop-yield of, 234.
— International regulations, Action of regarding, 498 (note).
Ayer, John, on Prohibition in Maine, 538.
Azore Islands, 12–13.

Babcock, D. C. (Rev.), Article by, 43; see also vi.
Bacchus, 39.
Bacon, Leonard Woolsey (Rev. Dr.), on Prohibition in New Haven, 526.
Bacone, A. C. (Prof.), vi.
Baily, Joshua L., 214 (note).
Bain, George W., Article by, 162–4.
Baird, Robert (Rev.),Biographical sketch of, 40.
Baker, Mary A., vi.
Baldwin, S. C. (Rev.), 72 (note).
Baltimore (Md.), Arrests in, 211.
Bands of Hope, 37, 40–1, 58, 60.
Bangor (Me.), Prohibition in, 505, 506.
Bankers, Testimony from, 538–9, 540, 541, 542.
Baptist Church, 41–2.
— Deliverance in Nebraska concerning High License,215.
Barbour, John Nathaniel, Biographical sketch of, 42.
Barley, 42.
— Quantities of used in making malt and distilled liquors, 172.
Barnes, Albert, Biographical sketch of, 42–3.
Barnes, Frances J., 650 (note).
Barrett, F. N., Estimate by, of the expenditure for drink, 137-8.
Barrows, Lorenzo Dow (Rev. Dr.), Biographical sketch of, 43.
Bartemeyer v. Iowa, Case of, 91, 645.
Bartenders, 386.
Bartram, W. H. H., 89 (note).
Bascom, John (LL.D.), Articles by, 401–3, 496–9.
Basutoland, 14.
Bates, C. A., 638–9.
Bayard, Thomas F. (Secretary), and the liquor traffic in the Pacific Islands, 643.
Beaconsfield (Earl), on the results of local Prohibition, 536.
Beauchamp, L. J., vi.
Beaumont, Ralph J., 264 (note).
Beaver, James A. (Governor), 123.
Bechuanaland, 14-15.
Bee, The Omaha, 217, 445, 447.
Beecher, Lyman (Rev. Dr.), Biographical Sketch of, 43-5.
Beer, 413-14. (See "Malt Liquors.")
Beer act (England), 366.
Beer Company case, 91, 92, 93.
Belgium, 45-6.
— Consumption of liquors in, 134.
— International regulations, Action of regarding, 497 (note), 498 (note).
"Bell-Punch" laws, 304-5, 348, 354.
Benefits of Prohibition (see "Prohibition, Results of").
Benguela, 17.
Berlin Conference (1884), 15-16.
Beverage consumption of spirits much in excess of legitimate consumption, 19, 130-1, 136-7, 615 (note).
Bhang, 202.
Bible and Drink, 46-8.
Bible Wines, 48-56.
Biblical Arguments:
— against Prohibition, 26.
——— Abolition, 32.
Birney, James G., 33.
Bitters, 617.
Black, James, Biographical sketch of, 56-7. (See also vi, 559 [note], and "Prohibition Party.")
Blackmer, John (Dr.), Article by, 421-2.
Blackstone, William (Sir), on natural, civil and political liberty, 471, 473.
Blade, The Toledo, 27, 401.
Blaine, James G.:
— Defeat of, 27, 32, 574.
— on Prohibition in Maine, 502, 538.
——— Prohibition as a State issue, 109.
——— the liquor revenue, 593.
——— the origin of the Republican party, 586.
Blair, Henry W., Article by, 439-42.
"Blind Pig" and "Blind Tiger" laws, 279. 317, 349.
Blood, Diffusion of alcohol through the, 20-2.
Blue Cross, 45, 624.
Blue Ribbon, 57, 61. 110, 197, 456, 624.
Blyth, Governor (Australia), 35.
Bodwell (Governor), on Prohibition in Maine, 504.
Body, Effects of alcohol on the, 20-6. (See also "Medical Testimony.")
Bohemians (in America), 181.
Bolag system, 455, 623-4.
Bolton, R., Temperance pledge of, 484-5.
Bonded period, Extension of the, 640.
Bonfort's Wine and Spirit Circular:
— on changes in the McKinley bill, 640.
——— the character and policy of the liquor-traders, 387.
——— the High License issue, 120.
——— the National Protective Association's work, 116.
——— the Boutelle resolution, 595.
Boniface, St., 599.
Booth, William, on poverty in London, 467.
"Bootleggers," 508 (note).
Booza, a malt liquor, 11.
Bordeaux wines, 648.
Boston (Mass.):
— High License, Results of in, 213.
— Prohibition, Results of in, 528-9, 537.
Boutelle resolution, The, 594-5.

Bouvier, on license and tax, 360 (note).
Bowman case, 646.
Boyce, F. B. (Rev.), 37 (note).
Bradford, S. B. (Attorney-General), on Prohibition in Kansas, 510.
Bradley, D. O., on Prohibition in Kansas, 540.
Brady, E. W., 105 (note).
Brain, The, Peculiarly affected by alcohol, 21, 24, 25.
Brandy, 10, 19, 480–1, 616–17.
Brayton, Charles R., 124, 126.
Brazil, 612.
Brewer, David J. (Judge), 90–1, 93 (note).
Brewers:
— Adulterations by, 9–10.
— Frauds on the revenue by, 639–40 (note).
— Mortality of, 404, 408.
— Number of, 382-3
Brewers' Congresses (see " United States Brewers' Association ").
Brewers' Journal, Quotations from or references to, 10, 213, 374, 414, 446, 507.
Brewing, 57–8. (See also "Malt Liquors.")
Bribery, Instances of, 104, 120–3, 200, 445, 446–7, 572.
Bridge, J. K., 370 (note).
Briggs, George N., 58.
Bright's disease, Caused by drink, 25.
British Columbia, 65, 66.
British Guiana, 612-13.
British Medical Association, Longevity statistics of the, 406–8.
British Women's Temperance Association, 58.
Brooklyn (N. Y.), Arrests in, 211.
Brooks, John Anderson, Biographical sketch of, 58-9. (See also vi, 148 [note], and "Prohibition Party.")
Brooks law, 120, 213-14, 339-41.
Brougham (Lord), on the results of legislative discriminations in favor of beer, 366.
Brown, Ryland T., vi.
Brunton, T. Lauder (Dr.) on the effects of beer-drinking, 179.
Brussels Conference (1890), 498 (note).
Bryan, Rollo Kirk, vi.
Buchanan, James (President), 147.
Buckham, M. H., on Prohibition in Vermont, 523.
Buddhists and drink, 59-60, 222-3, 262. (See also "India.")
Buell, Caroline B., vi.
Buffalo (N. Y.), Arrests in, 211.
Bulgaria, 633.
Burgundy wines, 19, 648.
Burmah, 59-60.
Burns, Dawson (Rev. Dr.), Contribution from, 195; see also iv.
Burns, John, 266.
Business, Effects of Prohibition upon, 537-45.
Business men and Prohibition, 447, 538-45.
Butler, Benjamin F., on Prohibition in Massachusetts, 527-8.
Butylic alcohol, 18, 155.

Cadets of Temperance, 60.
Caine, W. S. (M. P.):
— on Compensation, 95.
——— the drink traffic in India, 242-3.
Calhoun, John C. (Secretary), on the spirit ration in the army, 642 (note).
California:
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 382, 383, 384.
— Hop culture in, 234.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 279-80.
— Opium Prohibition in, 460.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in 564, 568, 573, 577.
California wines, 373-4, 648.
Cambridge (Mass.):
— Local Option victories in, 400.
— Prohibition and High License in, 532-3.
Caña, a South American intoxicant, 613, 617.
Canada, 60-7.
— Consumption of liquors in, 134, 364.
— License and Prohibition. Results of in, 142, 533.
Canadian Commission, 62, 503-4, 505.
Canary wines, 12, 19, 648, 649.
Candidates, Presidential and Vice-Presidential, of the Prohibition party, 56-7, 58-9, 146, 158-9, 176-7, 603, 605, 610, 620, 626.
Canterbury, Province of (Eng), Prohibition in, 536.
Cape Colony 14.
Cape wines, 14, 19, 648.
Capital Invested
— in the liquor business, United States, 374, 378, 379-81; Great Britain, 95 (note).
——— the malting business, 412.
Capitol Building, Prohibition in the, 644.
Caraca, a Mexican intoxicant, 430.
Carlisle, John G. (Speaker), 149-50.
Carlowitz wines, 648.
Carlyle, Thomas, 90.
Carpenter, W. B. (Dr.), on the hereditary transmission of alcoholic diseases, 235.
Carroll, H. K. (LL.D.), Plea of before the Republican Convention, 594.
Carson League, The, 67.
Carson, Thomas L., Biographical sketch of, 67.
Cass, Lewis, 96.
Cassis, a liqueur, 618.
Catholic Temperance Societies, 68. (See also "Roman Catholic Church.")
Cause and Consequence, 68-70.
Central America, 70.
Cette wines, 648.
Ceylon, 242.
Chablis wine, 647, 648.
Chamberlain (Governor), on Prohibition in Maine, 504.
Chambers, John (Rev. Dr.), Biographical sketch of, 70-1.
Champagne, 647, 648.
— Imitation of, 8.
— Imports of, 238 9.
— Vineyards attacked by the phylloxera, 479.
Channing, William Ellery (Rev. Dr.), Biographical sketch of, 71-2.
Character of liquor-traders, 387, 489.
Charles XII. (Sweden), Prohibitory laws of, 623.
Charles XIV. (Sweden), 40.
Charleston (W. Va.), Prohibition and High License in, 535.
Chartreuse, a liqueur, 19, 618.
Cheever, George B. (Rev. Dr.), v.
Cherokee Nation, Prohibition in, 295.
Chesterfield (Lord), Prohibition speech of, 617 (note).
Cheves, R. S., Interview of with H. P. Crowell, 120-2.
Chica, a South American intoxicant, 613.
Chicago (Ill.):
— Citizens' League of, 267.
— High License in, 210, 212, 216-17.
— Saloons of owned by the brewers, 379.
Chickasaw Nation, Prohibition in, 295.
Chickering, J. W., vi.
Chickering, John White (Rev. Dr.), Biographical sketch of, 72.
Chili, 613.
China, 72-9.
Chisholm, John B., 265.
Chloral, 79-80.

Chlorodyne, 79-80.
Chloroform, 79-80.
Choate, Joseph H., and the brewers, 92.
Choctaw Nation, Prohibition in, 295.
Christian Church, 80.
Christian, George C., Article by, 474-6.
Christians as corrupters of the heathen, 11, 59, 75, 136, 242-5, 246-7, 470, 607.
Christiansen case, 472-3, 646.
Christ's teachings, Different views of, 26, 47-8, 55-6, 86-8.
Chronic diseases from alcohol, 25.
Church, Duty of the, 43, 44, 178, 457.
Church of England, 197, 198.
Church of God, 80-1.
Church Temperance Society, 81.
Church, The, Charges of lukewarmness against, 31-2.
Church Utterances (see "Religious Denominations").
Cider, 649.
Cigarettes, Legislation regarding, 630.
Cincinnati (O.), Lawlessness of the saloons in, 268-70.
Cirrhosis from alcohol, 25.
Cities:
— Cost of supporting the police in, 546-7.
— High License and low license, Results of in, 210-14, 270, 526.
— Local Option contests in, 396, 398, 399, 400.
— Prohibition, Results of in, 505-6, 510-12, 517-18, 525-7, 528-9, 530-7, 544-5.
Civil Damage acts (see the digests of State laws, 275-360).
Claflin (Governor), on Prohibition in Massachusetts, 528.
Claret, 19, 647, 648.
Clark, Andrew (Dr.), on the effects of alcohol, 421.
Clark, Billy James, 82.
Clark, Myron H. (Governor):
— Election of, 562.
— on Prohibition in New York, 530.
Clarke, Adam, 88.
Clarkson, J. S., Attempt of to bribe St. John, 573.
Clay, Henry:
— on Father Mathew's work, 419.
——- Slavery and the Abolitionists, 32-3.
Clement of Alexandria, 49, 87.
Clergy, The
— and the liquor issue (Instances), 104, 112, 116, 117, 119, 122, 128, 189, 197-8, 237, 369, 432, 471, 478, 608. (See also "Religious Denominations.")
——— the slavery issue, 31, 32, 272.
Cleveland, Frances F., 644.
Climatic influences, 82-3.
Cocaine, 79 80.
Cocculus Indicus, used in adulterating, 8, 9, 10.
Cockburn (Lord Chief-Justice), on Compensation, 94.
Coffee-Houses, 81, 83-4, 153.
Cognac brandy, Supply of practically exhausted by the phylloxera's ravages, 480-1.
Cold, Fatal effects of expedited by alcohol, 24, 82-3.
Coleman, Julia, vi.
Coleridge (Lord Chief-Justice), on drink and crime, 365.
Colfax, Schuyler, 96, 644.
Collier, William, Biographical sketch of, 84.
Cologne spirit, 615-16.
Colombia, United States of, 613.
Colonial legislation (see "Legislation").
Colorado:
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 882, 383, 384.
— Farmers of, Resolutions by, 171.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 280-1.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 573, 577.
Coloring matters used in adulterating, 8, 616, 618.
Colquitt, A. H. (Senator), 110, 114, 153.
Columella, 49.
Commercial Gazette, The Cincinnati, 107, 574, 593-4, 595.
Commercial prosperity, Influence of Prohibition on, 447, 537-45.
Commercial spirits, 614-16.
Commercial Temperance League, 84-5.
Commission of Inquiry, 640.
Common Law, 85-6.
Communion Wine, 86-8.
Compensation, 88-96.
— Provided for in Australia, 36; in Switzerland, 624.
Compensation for slaves, Proposed by President Lincoln, 587 (note).
Compromise, Efforts in behalf of, 27-30, 33, 207-20, 362-7, 390-400.
Conger, E. H. (Congressman), on Prohibition in Iowa, 542.
Congo, Rum on the, 15-16, 498 (note).
Congregational Church, 96.
Congress, Temperance measures in, 640-4.
Congressional Temperance Society, 96-7.
Connecticut:
— Constitutional Prohibition movement in, 102, 103, 127-8.
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 382, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 281-5.
— Local Option votes in, 398.
— Prohibition and license in, 526-7.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 564, 566, 568, 573, 577.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
Connor (Governor), on Prohibition in Maine, 504.
Consolidation of the liquor interests, 374-9.
Constantia wine, 648.
Constitution, The Atlanta, 534, 544, 557-8 (note).
Constitutional Prohibition:
— National, 439-42.
— State, 97-128, 443-50.
— (See "Religious Denominations.")
Constitutionality of Prohibition (see "Judicial Decisions").
Constitutions, Provisions of
— Anti-License articles, 98.
— License Amendments, proposed but not adopted, 101, 108, 445.
— Local Option articles, 288, 348.
— Miscellaneous, 276, 290, 291, 305.
— Prohibitory Amendments or articles, adopted, 100-2; proposed but not adopted, 99, 100-2, 445; adopted, but annulled by Supreme Court, 106; repealed, 102.
Consular reports, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17, 39, 479-82, 494, 613, 614, 624, 647.
Consumption of liquors, 128-35.
— How affected by High License and Prohibition, 122, 210-20, 502-37.
— (See also the various foreign countries.)
Conventions:
— National Temperance, 631.
— Prohibition party, 561-2, 563-4, 565-6, 567-8, 569, 570-2, 575-6.
Convicts, Appeal of to the voters of Tennessee, 114-15.
Cook, Joseph, Article by, 360-2.
Copiah County, Prohibition in, 557-8.
Cordials, 617-18.
Corea, 135-6.
Corn, Quantity of used in the manufacture of spirituous liquors, 172.
Cornell, John Black, Biographical sketch of, 136.
Coroners, Testimony from, 26, 436.
Corruption (see "Poltical Corruption").
Cost of the drink traffic (United States), 136-40, 546-7. (See also the various foreign countries.)
Cotten, C. B., on adulterations, 7-8.
Crafts, Wilbur F. (Rev.), Article by, 495-6.

Crafts, W. F. (Mrs.), vi.
Craig, W. H., Biographical sketch of, 140–1.
Cramer, M. J., 153 (note).
Crampton, C. A., Report by on adulterations, 234.
Cranfill, J. B., 41, 112 (note).
Cranmer, S. H., 126 (note).
Creosote, Used in adulterating, 8, 10.
Crime, Relations of drink to, 141–3.
— Beer-drinkers and whiskey-drinkers, Offenses of compared, 365.
— Estimates of the percentage of crime due to drink, 45, 139, 141–2, 153–4, 365, 529 (note), 546–7.
— Expenditure on account of 139, 546 7.
— Physicians, English, on, 423.
— Supreme Court of the United States on, 93, 473.
— under High License and low license systems, 210–14, 521.
——— Prohibitory systems, 502–37.
Crogman, W. H., 451.
Crosby, Howard (Rev. Dr.):
— Articles by, 26–7, 48–50.
— Important references to, 216, 385, 446, 494.
Crothers, T. D. (Dr.), Articles by, 204–7, 247–8.
Crouch, G. J., 36.
Crowell, Harry P., Revelations by, 120–2.
Crozier, O. R. L., vi.
Crusade, The Woman's, 143–5.
Cumberland Presbyterian Church, 145.
Curaçoa, a liqueur, 19, 618.
Cures of inebriates, Percentage of in inebriate asylums, 248.
Cushing, Henry Dearborn, Biographical sketch of, 145-6.
Cushing, Volney B., Article by, 471–4.
Cuyler, Theodore L. (Rev. Dr.), Article by, 263–4.

Dakota Territory, Liquor legislation in, 285-6.
Dalmatian wines, 648.
Danforth, Charles (Justice), on Prohibition in Maine, 548.
Daniel, William, Biographical sketch of, 146.
Davenport (Ia.), Prohibition in, 517.
Davis, Jefferson, 112-13.
Davis, Noah. Estimate by of the percentage of crime due to drink.
Davis, N. S. (Dr.), on the medicinal use of alcohol, 421.
Davitt, Michael, on the consequences of drink in Ireland, 266.
Death penalty inflicted on liquor-sellers and users in China 73, 74; on opium-vendors, 76.
Death-rates of total abstainers and drinkers compared, 404-9.
Deaths from drink, 435-7.
Decisions, Judicial (see "Judicial Decisions").
Decomposition essential to the production of alcohol, 18.
Deems, Charles F. (Rev.), 560.
Deering, E. J., on diseases due to drink. 437.
Defeats of Prohibition, 101-4, 111-126, 127-8, 443-50.
Defective persons, 139.
Defiance of law, 268-72.
Delagoa Bay, 15.
Delano, H. A. (Rev.), vi.
Delano, William H. (Rev. Dr.), Biographical sketch of, 146-7.
Delavan, Edward Cornelius, Biographical sketch of, 147.
Delaware:
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 382, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 286-7.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 573, 577.
Delirium tremens, 147-8.
Democratic party, 148-53. (See also 31, 32, 449, 585-6.)
Demorest medal contests, 631-2.
Denmark, 153-4.
— Consumption of liquors in, 133-4.
— International regulations, Action of regarding, 497 (note); 498 (note).
Des Moines (Ia.), Prohibition in, 517.
Dewey, A. M., 264 (note).
Dickie, Samuel (Prof.), 111 (note), 574.
Dike, S. W. (LL.D.), Article by, 155-6.
Dingley (Governor), on Prohibition in Maine, 504.
Dionysus, 39.
Dioscorides, 229.
Dipsomania, 154.
Direct Veto, 36, 196 259, 608.
Disciple Church, 154.
Discriminations in favor of light liquors (see "Light Liquors;" also the digests of State laws, 275-360).
Disease, The treatment of with alcohol, 420-5.
Diseases from drink, 25, 147-8, 154, 161. (See also "Medical Testimony.")
— Hereditary transmission of, 204-7.
Disorder (Social), Supreme Court of the United States on the relations of drink to, 93, 473.
Disorderly conduct (see "Arrests and Commitments").
Dispensatory (United States), 17-18, 615 (note).
Disraeli, Benjamin, on the results of local Prohibition, 536.
Distillation, 154-5.
— in ancient China, 72.
Distilled liquors (see "Spirituous Liquors").
Distilleries, Regulations for (Federal), 636-7.
Distillers
— and the Internal Revenue, 256.
— Frauds Committed by, 639.
— Number of, 382-3.
Distress warrants in Atlanta, 555-6.
District of Columbia:
— Brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 641-42.
— Prohibition of sales of liquor to soldiers, 370-1.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
Divorce, 155-6.
Doctoring of drinks (see "Adulteration").
Dodge, Albert, vi.
Dodge City (Kan.), Prohibition in, 512.
Dodge, William Earl, Biographical sketch of, 156-7.
Dorchester, Daniel (Rev. Dr.), 454.
Dougall, John, Biographical sketch of, 157-8.
Dow, Neal:
— Articles by, 109, 411-12.
— Biographical sketch of, 502.
— (See also "Prohibition Party.")
Dow law (Ohio), 335.
Dow riots, The, 271-2.
Downing High License law, 59, 209, 320-1.
Dracut (Mass.), Novel license experiment in, 550.
Drink Bill
— of the United States, 136-40.
——— Great Britain, 195.
Drink Traffic (see "Liquor Traffic").
Dropsy from alcohol, 25.
Druggists, 159.
— Legislation governing sales of liquor by (see the digests of State laws, 275-360).
— Quantities of spirits sold by, 615 (note).
Drugs used in adulterating (see "Adulteration").
Drunkenness, Arrests for (see "Arrests and Commitments").
Dry wines, 648.
"Dual Basis," 81, 197.
Duffield, D. Bethune, 111, 176.
Dumfermline Association, 83, 607.
Duniway, Abigail Scott, 115.

Drunkards, 187.
Dunlop, John, 423, 607.
Dupetiaux, M., on drink in Belgium, 45.
Dutch Reformed Church, 160.
Dutton (Governor), on Prohibition in Connecticut, 526.

East India Company, 76, 77.
Eau de vie, 618.
Economic Aspects
— of Prohibition, 537-57.
——— the drink traffic, 385-7.
Eddy, Richard (Rev. Dr.), vi.
Edgar, John, Biographical sketch of, 160.
Edgeworth, Maria, on Father Mathew's work, 418.
Edkins (Dr.), 72, 75.
Edwards, Justin, Biographical sketch of, 161.
Effects of alcohol, 20-6. (See also "Medical Testimony.")
Effervescing wines, 648.
Egypt, 11-12. (See also "Historical and Philosophical.")
Elder, 19.
Election day, Prohibition of sales on (see digests of State laws, 275-360).
Elgin (Lord), 76.
Emmons, Francis W. (Rev.), 527 (note).
Employes of the liquor traffic, 384-6.
"Encyclopædia Britannica"
— on adulterations, 7, 9, 617 (note).
——— hops used in beer, 172.
——— Wine production in Portugal, 493 (note).
Enforcement of law, 266 8.
England:
— Coffee-house movement in, 84.
— Compensation struggle in, 94-6.
— Consumption of liquors in, 131-2, 365.
— Drink Bill of, 195.
— India, Excise policy of in, 242-4.
— International regulations, Action of regarding, 497, 498 (note).
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 9, 170, 195-6, 231-2, 272-4, 366.
— Longevity, Comparative, of abstainers and drinkers in, 404-9.
— Mortality from drink in, 25 6, 435-6.
— Opium traffic, Responsibility of for the, 76-8, 244-5.
— Prohibition (Local), Results of in, 536,
— Right of petition in, 475.
— Sumptuary laws of, 622.
— Temperance organizations and movement in, 40-1, 57, 58, 196-7, 389-90.
English, J. B. (Rev.), vi.
English brewery syndicates, 374-5.
Epilepsy from drink, 25, 161.
Episcopalians (see "Protestant Episcopal Church".
Equal Suffrage, 162-7.
Essenes, The, 47.
Ether, 79-80.
Ethics of license, 167-9.
Eusebius, 47.
Evangelical Adventist Church, 169.
Evangelical Church, 169 70.
Evans, Thomas, Jr., 573.
Evans, Walter (Commissioner), and the brewers, 639.
Evening Post, The New York, 489 (note), 587.
"Evil, and only evil, and that continually," 335.
Ewing, Emma P., vi.
Excise, 170.
Expenditure for drink (see "Cost of the Drink Traffic").
Exports (see "Imports and Exports").

Fall River (Mass.), Prohibition and High License in, 553.
Falsehoods (instances), 119, 123, 511, 553-4.
Falsification of wines, 7-9, 133, 647.
Farm Herald, The, 388, 446.
Farmers and the drink issue, 35, 111, 122, 126, 170-4, 448.
Faroe Islands, 154.
Farrar (Archdeacon), iv, 13-14 (note), 198.
Faxon, Henry H., on the employment of detectives, 268.
Federal Government, The, 634-46.
"Federal permits" in Prohibition States, 257, 504-5, 507, 513, 520, 522, 524.
Federation and concentration of the liquor interests, 372-9.
Fermentation, 174-5.
Fermented Liquors:
— Nearly the entire product of used as beverage, 19.
— Not produced among the Chinese, 72.
— (See "Malt Liquors" and "Vinous Liquors.")
Fernald, Henry B., 634 (note).
Fernald, J. C. (Rev.), Articles by, 237-41, 268-72.
Fernald, Nettie B., vi.
Fictitious wines, 7-9.
Field, Kate, 122, 363.
Field, Stephen J. (Justice), 93 (note), 472-3.
Field, W. W., on Prohibition in Iowa, 516-17.
Fillmore, Millard (President), 147.
Finch, John B.:
— Biographical sketch of, 175-6.
— on High License in Nebraska, 215.
"Fine" whiskey, Comparative insignificance of the production of, 376-7.
"Fire and brimstone, clubs, pitchforks and butcher-knives," 574.
Fisk campaign, 575-8.
Fisk, Clinton B., Biographical sketch of, 176-7. (See also "Prohibition Party.")
Fisk, Wilbur, 32, 177-8.
Flick, James F. (Congressman), on Prohibition in Iowa, 517.
Florida:
— Brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 287-8.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 573, 577.
Flournoy, Josiah, Biographical sketch of, 178-9.
Food, Alcohol not a, 179-80.
Foote (Rear-Admiral), 371.
Foraker, Joseph B., 29, 107.
Foreigners, 180-2.
Foresters, Order of, Longevity statistics of, 404.
Fortifying of wines, 7-9, 12, 14, 481, 614, 647.
"Forty cents a line," 446 (note).
Foster, Charles (Governor), 106.
Foster, J. Ellen (Mrs.), 454, 652.
Four-Mile law (Tennessee), 347.
Fraizer, Samuel, Biographical sketch of, 182.
France, 183-6.
— Adulterations in, 132-3, 647.
— Consumption of liquors in, 132, 184, 364.
— International regulations, Action of regarding, 497 (note), 498 (note).
— Phylloxera, Ravages of in, 478-81.
— Tyrannical action of in the Sandwich Islands, 607.
Franklin, Benjamin, 30, 264.
Frauds in the interest of the liquor-traders (instances), 108, 111-12, 115 16, 375 (note).
Frauds on the revenues, 639.
Frederick William III. (Prussia), 40.
Free Baptists, 186.
Free Methodists, 186.
Free-Soil party, 33.
Frelinghuysen, Theodore, 96.
French, The (in America), 181.
French spirits, 616.
Friends, 186, 246.
Frontignan wines, 648.
Frost, William Goodell (Prof.), Article by, 166-7

Frost, Walter B., Statistics prepared by, 526, 543–4.
Fruit distilleries, 375.
"Fruit of the vine," 46, 48, 49, 55, 86, 87, 88.
Frye, William P. (Senator), on Prohibition in Maine, 502–3, 538.
Fugitive Slave law, 32.
Funk, I. K. (Rev. Dr.), 573, 597.
Fusel oil, 8, 10, 18, 20, 155.

Galen, 229.
Gambling, Naturally allied to liquor-selling, 361, 372.
Gambrell, Roderick Dhu, Biographical sketch of, 186–7.
Gambrinus, 187.
Ganja, 202.
Gardner, Mills, on the failure of the non-partisan plan, 453.
Generous wines, 648.
Geneva, 617.
Georgia :
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 382, 383, 384.
— Flournoy movement in, 178.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 288–91.
— Oglethorpe's Prohibitory law, 247, 288–9.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 573, 577.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
German Baptists, 187.
German Reformed Church, 187.
Germans (in America), 100, 105, 106–7, 182, 365, 590–1.
Germany, 187–91.
— Consumption of liquors in, 133.
— Hop-yield of, 234.
— International regulations, Action of regarding, 497, 498 (note), 643 (note).
Gibbud, H. B., vi.
Giddings, Joshua R., 32.
Gifford, George (Consul), on adulterations, 10.
Gillette, Walter R. (Dr.), on the physiological effects of drink, 408–9.
Gin, 19, 617.
Gin acts, 273–4.
Gipps, Governor (Australia), 35.
Gladstone, W. E., 95–6, 196.
Gladwin, Wallace J., 242 (note).
Golden Cross, United Order of the, 631.
Goodell, D. H. (Governor), 117.
Goodell, William, Biographical sketch of, 191–2.
Good Templars (see "Independent Order of Good Templars").
Gooseberry wine, 19.
Gospel Temperence, 192.
Gothenburg system, 455, 623–4.
Gottheil (Rabbi), on Passover wines, 465.
Gougar, Helen M., Article by, 164–6.
Gough, John B., Biographical sketch of, 192–4.
Governors, Testimony from, 504, 510, 516, 526, 528, 530, 538, 539, 540, 541–2, 551.
Grady, Henry W., on Prohibition in Atlanta, 534, 545, 554–6.
Graham, Robert, Article by, 81.
Grain distilleries, 375–8.
Grain, Quantities of used in the manufacture of spirituous and malt liquors, 172.
Grange, The, and Prohibition, 170–1.
Gray, Charlotte A., Article by, 45–6.
Gray, C. M., 37 (note).
Greacen, Robert A., 137 (note).
Great Britain, 194–7. (See "England.")
Greece, 220–1. (See also "Historical and Philosophical.")
Greeley (Col.), Prohibition in, 535–6.
Greeley, Horace, 198 200, 466, 591.
Greene, H. E. (Dr.), on the medicinal use of alcohol, 412.
Greene, Jacob L., on the effects of beer-drinking, 408.
Greenhut, J. B., Statements from, concerning the Whiskey Trust, 377, 378, 449 (note).
Greenland, 154.
Greenock Society, 607.
Gregson, James G. (Rev.), 83, 244.
Grier (Justice), on Prohibition, 645.
Griffin, Albert:
— Anti-Saloon Republican movement of, 27–30.
— Statistics prepared by, 363.
Griffis, William Elliott (Rev. Dr.), Articles by, 135–6, 260–2, 433–4, 632–3.
Grog, 616.
Grog ration in the navy, 642–3.
Guernsey, Alice M., 650 (note).
Gustafson, Axel :
— Article by, 35–7.
— on the London Temperance Hospital, 425.
— (See also iv, vi.)
Guthrie, Thomas (Rev. Dr.), Biographical sketch of, 200–1.

Habitual drunkards, intoxicated persons, etc., Legislation concerning sales of liquor to (see the digests of State laws, 275-360).
Haddock, George C. (Rev. Dr.), Biographical sketch of, 201-2.
Haight, J. Mason, Letter of Abraham Lincoln to, 370.
Haines, S. A., Article by, 84-5.
Hale, Eugene (Senator), on Prohibition in Maine, 503.
Hale, John P., 33.
Hale, Matthew (Chief-Justice), on the relations of drink to crime, 141.
"Half-a-Loaf," 168, 169, 360.
Hale, J. A. (Consul), on adulterations of sherry, 614.
Hall, John (Rev. Dr.), vi.
Halstead, Murat, 574.
Hamilton, Alexander, on Excise laws, 251–2.
Hamlin, Hannibal, on Prohibition in Maine, 503.
Hamilton, J. W., on Prohibition in Kansas, 510.
Hammond, C. A., vi.
Hammond, William A. (Dr.), 10, 83, 179.
Hanbal, Ibn, 69.
Hardy, H. W., on High License in Nebraska, 215.
Hargreaves, William (Dr.), vi, 139.
Harlan (Justice), 93.
Harper, Frances E. W., 451.
Harper law, 209.
Harris, Elisha (Dr.), on the relations of drink to crime, 141-2.
Harris, F. McC. (Mrs.), vi.
Harrison, Benjamin (President), on Prohibition, 593, 644.
Hart, Coleridge A., Article by, 272.
Hartwell, C. (Rev.), 72 (note).
Hasheesh, 202-3.
— in Egypt, 11.
—— India, 244-5.
Hawaiian Islands, 606-7.
Hawkins, John Henry Willis, Biographical sketch of, 203.
Hawley, Joseph R. (Senator), 128.
Hayes, Lucy Webb, Biographical sketch of, 203-4.
Hebrews (see "Jews").
Heckewelder, John (Rev.), 246.
Helwig, J. B. (Rev. Dr.), vi.
Hemp, Indian, 11, 79, 202.
Henry, S. M. I. (Mrs.), vi.
Heredity of the alcohol habit and its effects, 24-5, 204-5. (See also "Idiocy.")
Hermitage wines, 648.
Herndon, W. H., on Lincoln's temperance record, 368-9.
Herodotus, 49, 227.

Hewit, Nathaniel (Rev. Dr.), Biographical sketch of, 207.
High License, 207–20.
— States charging comparatively high fees (1889); Arkansas, 378; Colorado, 289; Florida, 288; Georgia; Illinois, 292; Massachusetts, 313; Michigan, 315; Minnesota, 317; Mississippi, 319; Missouri, 320; Montana (Territory), 321; Nebraska, 322, 323; Oregon, 337; Pennsylvania, 340, 341: Rhode Island, 342-3; Texas, 349; Utah (Territory), 350; Washington (Territory), 356; West Virginia, 357; Wyoming (Territory), 360.
— Antagonism of Prohibitionists to, 209-10.
— Claims for, 208.
— Consolidation of the liquor traffic promoted by, 379.
— Democratic party, The, and, 151-2.
— Enforcement of law under, Unsatisfactory results of, 269.
— English precedents, 274.
— France, Instructive experience of, 183-4.
— "High or low, vicious in principle, and powerless as a remedy," 426.
— India, Experience of, 242-4.
— Liquor-traders, Cheerful acceptance of by, 120, 122, 126, 218-20.
— Obstructive effects of, 104, 111, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 215-16, 362.
— Political influence of the rum power not diminished by, 490.
— Press, The daily and, 216-18.
— Republican party and, 592-4.
— Results of, 216-18, 518-21, 526, 531-5, 548-50.
— Sandwich Islands, 607.
— (See also the various religious denominations.)
High proof spirits, 19, 616.
High wines, 616.
Hill, David B. (Governor), 152.
Hill, Eliza Trask, Article by, 434-5.
Hill, Gershom F., on Prohibition in Iowa, 516.
Hippocrates, 228-9.
Historical and Philosophical Notes on Intemperance, 220-32.
Hoar, George F. (Senator), on Prohibition and High License in Worcester, 532.
Hock, 19, 647, 648.
Hoffman, Clara C., Article by, 143 5.
Hogarth's "Gin Lane," 273.
Holbrook, M. E. (Dr.), vi.
Holiday Prohibition in Boston, 537.
Holland, 232-3.
— Consumption of liquors in, 134.
— International regulations, Action of regarding, 497 (note), 498 (note).
Holland, J. G. (Dr.), on Lincoln's temperance record, 369.
Hollanders (in America), 181-2.
Home Protection party, 232, 569.
— in Victoria, 37.
Homer, 226-7.
Honest whiskey, Comparative insignificance of the quantity produced, 370-1.
Hooker, George W., on Prohibition in Vermont, 523.
Hopkins, A. A., 573.
Hops, 233-4.
— Quantities of used in the manufacture of malt liquors, 172.
— Substitutes for, 9, 10, 234.
Hornady, W. T.:
— Article by, 182–3.
— on free rum on the Congo, 15–16.
Horton, Albert H. (Chief-Justice), on Prohibition in Kansas, 548, 554.
Hospital, The London Temperance, 424–5.
Hovas, Prohibition among the, 13.
Howe, J. G. (Dr.), Report by on idiocy 235.
Hoxie, C. De F., Article by, 128–35.
Hoyle, William, 195.
Hudson, George G. (Rev.), 262 (note).
Hudson, Henry B. (Rev.), vi.
Hudson, R. E., vi.
Hughes, Charles H. (Dr.), on diseases due to drink, 437.
Humphrey, Heman (Rev. Dr.), Biographical sketch of, 234.
Hungarians (in America), 181.
Hungary (see Austria).
— Phylloxera, ravages of the in, 481.
Hunt, Mary H. (Mrs.), vi, 607.
Hunt, Thomas Poage (Rev.), Biographical sketch of, 234–5.
Hunter, Governor (Australia), 35.
Huntington, D. W. C. (Rev. Dr.), vi.
Huss, Magnus, 623.
Hutchins, E. R., on Prohibition in Iowa, 515–16.
Hyde, William De W., on Prohibition in Maine, 503.
Hypertrophy from alcohol, 25.

Iceland, 154.
Idaho:
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 291.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
Idiocy, 235–6. (See also "Heredity.")
Ignorance:
— Not a sufficient explanation for the prevalence of the drink habit, 69–70.
— (See "Illiteracy.")
Iler, Peter E., on High License in Nebraska, 219. (See also 445, 449.)
Illinois:
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— High License, Results of in, 210, 212, 219.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 291-3.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 564, 566, 568, 573, 577.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
Illiteracy, 236–7.
— in Portugal, 493.
Imports and Exports, 237–41.
— Brandy from France, 480–1.
— Duty, Rates of, 637–8.
Independent Order of Good Templars, 241–2.
— Prohibition party, Part played by the Good Templars in the organization of the, 560, 561.
— (See Constitutional Amendment campaigns, 104-23, 445.)
— Foreign countries: Australasia, 37; Belgium, 45; Canada, 61; Denmark, 153; England, 197; Ireland, 259; Norway, 456; Russia, 605; Scotland, 608; Sweden, 624.
Independent Order of Rechabites, 37, 582.
India, 222–3, 242–5.
Indiana:
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 293–5.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 566, 573, 577.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
Indian Territory, Prohibition in, 295.
Indians (North American), 245–7, 295, 641–2. (See also the digests of State laws, 275–360.)
Inebriate asylums, 247–8.
Ingalls, John J. (Senator), on Prohibition in Kansas, 509–10, 539.
Injunction law, 248–51.
— States having Injunction provisions (1889): Iowa, 298; Kansas, 300, 301; New Hampshire, 325-6; North Dakota (1890), 333; South Dakota (1890), 613; Vermont, 353.
Inquiry bill, The, 640.

Insanity from drink, 15, 45, 139, 153, 184, 189.
— Prohibition States, Testimony from insane asylums in, 503, 516.
— (See also "Idiocy.")
Insurance statistics, 404-9.
"Intemperate temperance" men, 95, 574.
Inter-Collegiate Prohibition Association, 574.
Internal Revenue system, 251-7, 372-2, 583, 635-7.
— Tobacco regulations, 629-30.
International aspects, 15-16, 496-9, 643.
Iowa:
— Constitutional Prohibition in, 99-100, 102, 105-6.
— Farmers of, Resolutions by, 171.
— "Federal permits" in, 383, 384, 513.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 295-9.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 566, 568, 573, 577.
— Prohibition, Results of in, 513-22, 541-3, 548-50.
Ireland, 257-9, 417-20.
— Davitt, Michael, on the consequences of drink in, 266.
Ireland, John (Archbishop), 68, 181, 216, 598-9, 600.
Irish, The (in America), 181, 365.
Irish Whiskey, 19, 42, 616.
Israelites (see "Jews").
Italy:
— Consumption of liquors in, 134.
— International regulations, Action of regarding, 498 (note).
Iti, 72.

Jackson, Andrew (President), 147.
Jamaica, 259-60.
Jamaica Rum, 10, 35, 260.
Japan, 260-2.
Jeffries, Julius, Medical declaration drawn up by, 422-3.
Jewell, Benjamin R., Article by, 611-12.
Jewett, Charles (Dr.), Biographical sketch of, 262-3.
Jews, 12, 263, 470, 605. (See also "Bible and Drink," "Bible Wines," "Historical and Philosophical," "Palestine" and "Passover Wines.")
Joachimsen, P. J., on Passover wines, 464-5.
Johnson, Andrew (President), 147.
Johnson, Herrick (Prof.), on High License, 361.
Johnson, William E., Letters of liquor men to, 220 (note).
Johnston, W. A. (Justice), on Prohibition in Kansas, 540.
Joliet (Ill.), High License in, 210, 212.
Journal. The Indianapolis, 594.
Journal, The Providence, 110.
Joy, Benjamin, Biographical sketch of, 263-4.
Judges, Testimony from:
— on the results of High License, 519-20.
—— the results of Prohibition, 507-9, 514-15, 539-40, 548, 551, 554.
Judicial decisions, 90, 91, 92-4, 106, 250-1, 472-3, 644-6.
Jukes family, The, 142, 205 (note).
Junior Prohibition Clubs, 574.
Jury trials, Refusal of under certain Prohibitory laws, 248-51.
Juvenile Temperance Societies, 40-1, 60, 68, 71, 409.

Kama (Chief), 15.
Kansas:
— Constitutional Prohibition in, 100 102, 104-5.
— "Federal permits" in 383, 384, 507.
— Injunction law of, 249-51.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 299. 302.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 566, 573, 577.
— Prohibition, Results of in, 560, 519-20, 539-41, 548 50.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
"Kansas cases," 92-4, 249-51.
Kansas City (Mo.), High License in, 210.
Kansas-Nebraska bill, The, 586.
Kelley, Harrison (Congressman), on Prohibition in Kansas, 510.
Kennedy, J. F. (Dr.), on Prohibition in Iowa, 516.
Kent, Prof., 111.
Kentucky:
— Crime and illiteracy in the mountain counties of, 237, 558.
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 302-4.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
— Whiskey production in, 376-7.
Keokuk (Ia.), Prohibition in, 517.
Kephart, B. F. (Rev.), on the liquor traffic with Africa, 16-17.
Kerr, J. G. (Dr.), on drink in China, 74, 75.
Kerr, Norman (Dr.), vi.
— on chloral, etc., 80.
—— Mortality from drink, 435-6.
—— Narcomania, 438-9.
Kidd v. Pearson, 645-6.
Kimball, Lucia F. E., 650 (note).
Kincaid, William (Rev. Dr.), Article by, 430-2.
King's Daughters, 84.
Kirk, L. K., on Prohibition in Kansas, 539.
Kirschwasser, a liqueur, 618.
Kirsebaer, a liqueur, 618.
Kloster, Asbjörn, 456.
Knights of Labor, 123, 265-6.
Knights of Temperance, 264.
Koran, The, and drink. (See "Mohammedans.")
Koumiss, an intoxicant from mares' milk, 618.
Kümmel, a liqueur, 618.

Labor and Liquor, 264-6, 384-6, 447-8, 536, 544, 554-7.
Labouchere, Henry, 197.
Lachrymæ Christi, 647, 648.
Lalor, J. J., Article by, 251-5.
Lambert, T. S. (Dr.), 200.
Lamon, Ward H., on Lincoln's temperance record, 369.
La Monte, George, vi.
Lancet, The London, on beer adulterations, 9-10.
Landlords:
— Jointly responsible with saloon-keepers for damage done (see "Civil Damage Acts").
— Prohibition by, 195, 536.
Lankester, Edwin (Dr.), on mortality from drink, 25-6.
Larrabee (Governor), on Prohibition in Iowa, 516, 541-2, 551.
Lathrap, Mary T., vi, 650 (note).
Laurie, T. (Rev.), 72 (note).
Law and Order Leagues, 67, 266-8.
Law, Due process of, 90-4.
Lawlessness of the liquor-sellers, 268-72, 378-9.
Lawrence (Mass.), Prohibition and High License in, 532.
Lawson, Albert G. (Rev. Dr.), vi.
Lawson, Wilfrid (Sir), 196.
Leavenworth (Kan.), Prohibition in 511, 512, 553-4.
Leavitt, Mary Clement, Article by, 59-60. (See also vi, 13 [note], 37, 75, 242 [note], 262 [note], 607, 650 [note], 651.)
Lecky, W. E. H., on the effect of gin-drinking in England, 273.
Leech, Caroline A., 650 (note).
Lee, F. R. (Dr.):
— Article by, 46-8; see also iv.
— on the pledge, 484.
Legal Suasion, 272.
Legge (Dr.), 72, 73.
Legislation (Liquor):
— United States:
—— Colonial, 274, 281, 286, 288-9, 305-6, 309-10, 310-11, 324, 326, 328-9, 331, 338, 341, 344-5, 353.
—— Federal, 635-46.
—— State, 275-360.

— Other countries (see the separate countries).
Legislation (Tobacco), 629-30.
Leisy case, 646.
Leo XIII, (Pope), 46, 68, 598-9.
Leonard, A. B. (Rev. Dr.), vi.
Leonard campaign, 575.
Letheby, Henry (Ph. D.), on adulterations, 7.
Lever, The, 573.
Lewis, Dio (Dr.), 143, 144, 176.
Liberia, 16-17.
Liberty party, 30-3.
License:
— Distinction between license and tax, 624-5.
— General principles, 167-9, 360-2, 402-3.
— Legislation (see "Legislation").
— Restriction without, 597.
— (See also the various religious denominations.)]
"License cases," 90.
Liebig (Baron von), 180.
Life insurance statistics, 404-9.
Light liquors, 362-7.
— Appetite for spirits created by, 70, 366-7.
— Discriminations in favor of (see digests of State laws, 275-360).
— Experience of England, 365, 366.
——— France, 183-6, 364.
——— Germany, 187-91.
——— Norway, 454-5.
— Insurance officials on, 408-9.
— Pharmacopœia, The United States, on the dangers of wines, 648.
— (See also "Malt Liquors" and "Vinous Liquors.")
Lin (Commissioner), Seizure of opium by, 76.
Lincoln, (Neb.), High License in, 210, 215.
Lincoln, Abraham (President), 147, 367-71, 587.
Lincoln, Allen B., 127 (note).
Linnæus, 623.
Liqueurs, 317-18.
Liquor-dealers:
— Mortality of, 404-408.
— Number of, 383-4.
Liquor Traffic, 371-89.
Liquors (see "Malt Liquors," "Spirituous Liquors" and "Vinous Liquors").
Liquors, Adulterations of (see "Adulterations").
Lisbon wines, 19, 648.
"Livelihood, To sell rum for a," 199.
Livermore, Mary A., Article by, 477-8; see also vi.
Liverpool (Eng.), Prohibition in, 536-7.
Livesey, Joseph, Biographical sketch of, 389-90.
Local Option, 390-400.
— Contrasted with Constitutional Prohibition, 98.
— Democratic party and, 150-1.
— Legislation:
——— United States (see the digests of State laws, 275, 360).
——— Australasia, 38; Canada, 62-3; England (movement for), 196; Norway, 454-5; Scotland (movement for), 608; Sweden, 623-4.
— Obstructive tendency of, 118, 119, 392 4.
— Prohibition, Results of under, 580-7, 544-5, 554-6, 604.
— Republican party and, 591-2.
—Votes on, 396 400.
Locke, David Ross, Biographical sketch of, 400-1.
Locke, Joseph A., on Prohibition in Maine, 538.
Locke, Zoe M., 633 (note).
Logic, Liquor, 401-3.
London Temperance Hospital, 424 5.
Longevity, 404-9.
— France, Instructive facts from, 185.
"Look not on the wine when it is red," 224.
Lossing, Benson J., vi.
Lottery, Louisiana State, 305.
Louisiana:
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 304-5.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 573, 577.
Low License:
— States charging comparatively low fees (1889): Alabama, 276; Arizona (Territory), 277; California, 279; Connecticut, 283; Delaware, 287; Idaho (Territory), 291; Indiana, 294; Kentucky, 302; Louisiana, 305; Maryland, 310; Nevada, 323-4; New Jersey, 326; New Mexico (Territory), 327; New York, 330; North Carolina, 331-2; Ohio, 335: South Carolina, 345; Tennessee, 347; Virginia, 354-5; Wisconsin, 358.
— Results of compared with High License results, 210-14.
Low proof spirits, 616.
Low wines, 616.
Lowell (Mass.), Prohibition and High License in, 213, 533.
Loyal Temperance Legion, 409-10.
Lucas, Margaret Bright, Biographical sketch of, 410.
Lutheran Church, 410-11.
Lyman, H. S., 115 (note).
Lynch, John (Congressman), on Prohibition in Maine, 503.
Lynn (Mass.), High License in, 213.
Lyons, J. A., on Prohibition in Iowa, 542.

McClees, Sarah A., 634 (note).
McCulloch, Hugh (Secretary), and the whiskey men, 640
McKinley Tariff act, changed in the interest of the liquor-traders, 640.
McLagan, Peter (M. P.), 608.
McLean (Justice), on Prohibition, 645.
Macon wines, 648.
Madagascar, 13.
Madeira Islands, 12.
Madeira wines, 8, 9, 12, 647, 648.
Madison, James (President), 147.
Mail and Express, The New York, 28, 29, 594.
Maine:
— Constitutional Prohibition in, 101, 102, 109.
— "Federal permits" in, 383, 384, 504-5.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 305-9.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 568, 573, 577.
— Prohibition Results of in, 411-12, 502-6, 538-9, 548.
— Republican and Democratic parties as champions of Prohibition in, 588 (note).
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
Maine Law, 158-9, 306-9, 411-12.
Malaga wines, 19, 647, 648.
Malagasy, The, 13 (note).
Malden (Mass.), Prohibition in, 531.
Malins, Joseph, vi, 154 (note), 232 (note), 603 (note), 624 (note).
Malmroc, Oscar, Report of on the phylloxera, 480.
Malmsey wines, 19, 648.
Malt, 412-13.
— Brewing of the, 57-8.
— Substitutes for, 9, 10.
Malt Liquors, 413-14.
— Adulterations of, 9-10.
— Alcoholic strength of, 19.
— Brewing, Process of, 57-8.
— Consumption of, 128-35.
— Discriminations in favor of (see "Legislation").
— Entire product of used as beverage, 19.
— Expenditure for, 137.
— Exports of, 240.
— Imports of, 238-9.
— Insurance officials on, 408-9.

— Materials used in the manufacture of, 172–3.
— Nutritive purposes, Valueless for, 179–80.
— Railroad employes required to abstain from, 632 (note).
— Revenue from (Federal), 254.
— Supreme Court of the United States on the relations of to crime, pauperism, etc., 93.
— Taxes on (Federal), 636.
Magna Charta, 272.
Mandamus act (New York), 330.
Manitoba, 65, 66.
Mann, Horace, Biographical sketch of, 415–16.
Manning, Cardinal, 94 (note), 198, 599.
Manufacturers of liquors:
— Regulations for (Federal), 636–7.
Manufactures, arts, sciences, etc., Quantities of spirits used in the, 18, 19, 130–1, 615.
Maraschino, a liqueur, 618.
Marble (Governor), on Prohibition in Maine, 504.
Marc of grapes, 647, 648.
Marsala wine, 19, 647, 649.
Marsh, John (Rev. Dr.), Biographical sketch of, 416.
Marshall, Thomas, 96.
Martin, John A. (Governor), on Prohibition in Kansas, 510. 539.
Martindale, William, 79 (note).
Martyn, Carlos, Article by, 625–6.
Martyrs of the Prohibition cause, 186–7, 201–2.
Maryland:
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 309–10.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 566, 573, 577.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
Masai, Prohibition among the, 13.
Massachusetts:
— Constitutional Prohibition movement in, 102, 103, 117–19.
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— High License and Prohibition in, Results of, 212–13, 527–33.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 310–14.
— Local Option votes in, 396–8, 400.
— Pauperism in, due to drink, 465–6.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 562, 563, 564, 566, 568, 573, 577.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
Materials used in the manufacture of distilled and malt liquors, 172–3.
Mathew, Theobald, Biographical sketch of, 417–20.
Mauritius, 13.
Maynard, L. A., on Prohibition in Kansas, 540.
Meaden, J. W., Contribution from, 37–8.
Medford rum, 617.
Medical Testimony, 20–6, 83, 148, 179–80, 235–6, 367, 407–9, 420–5, 435–7, 482–3, 486, 583–4, 608–9, 632 (note), 648.
Medicinal purposes:
— Ancient medical writers, Views of, 229.
— Legislation concerning (see the digests of State laws, 275–360).
— Pure alcohol should be used in preference to alcoholic liquors, 19 (note).
— Quantity of spirits used for, 615 (note).
Medicine, Use of liquor as a, 420–5.
Médoc wines, 647, 649.
Melytic alcohol, 20.
Mennonites, 425.
Merrill, Selah (Rev. Dr.), Article by, 461–2.
Merson, J. D., 37 (note).
Mescal, a Mexican intoxicant, 429.
Metcalf, Henry B., vi.
Methodist Episcopal Church, 61, 215, 425–8.
Methodist Protestant Church, 428.
Methods of the anti-Prohibitionists, 104–28, 121–3, 186–7, 200–1, 268–72, 368, 371–89, 443–50, 488–90.
Methyl alcohol, 18, 20,616.
Metropolitan Police laws: Kansas, 301; Massachusetts, 314.
Mexico, 428–30.
Michigan:
— Anti-License article of the Constitution, 98–9.
— Constitutional Prohibition movement in, 101, 102, 103, 111–12.
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 314–16.
— Local Option victories in, 399.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 562, 564, 566, 568, 573, 577.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
Miller, George L., Letter of on the anti-Prohibition campaign in Nebraska, 449.
Miller, Walter (Prof.), Article by, 187–91.
Mill-feed, Quantity of used in the manufacture of spirituous liquors, 172.
Mills, Roger Q. (Congressman), 113.
Milwaukee (Wis.), Arrests in, 211.
Mind, Effects of alcohol on the, 22–3, 25.
Minneapolis (Minn.), High License in, 210, 521.
Minnesota:
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— High License, Results of in, 519, 521.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 316–18.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 564, 566, 568, 573, 577.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
Minor (Governor), on Prohibition in Connecticut, 526.
Minors:
— Sale of liquor to, Provisions against (see the digests of State laws, 275–360).
—— Tobacco to, 630.
Mishla, a Yucatan intoxicant, 430.
Missionaries, 12, 13, 17, 75, 78–9, 244.
Mississippi:
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 354.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 318–20.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 577.
Missouri:
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— High License, Results of in, 212, 518–19.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 320–1.
— Local Option votes in, 399.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 566, 573, 577.
Mitchell, E. R. (Dr.), on the hereditary effects of drink, 236.
Moderation, 430–3.
— Longevity, comparative, of moderate drinkers and abstainers, 404–9.
Mohammedans, 11, 12, 70, 242, 433–4, 461–2, 469–71, 633.
Mohler, M., on Prohibition in Kansas, 539.
Molasses, Quantities of used in the manufacture of spirituous liquors, 172.
Molasses distilleries, 375.
Monopolization of the liquor interests, 374–9.
Montana:
— Brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 321–2.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 577.
Moonshine distilleries, 376, 377.
Moore, R. W. (Prof.), 624 (note).
Moraka (Chief), Prohibitory decree of, 14–15.
Moral suasion, 434–5.
— Gough, John B., on, 193–4.
— Greeley, Horace, on, 199.
Morals, Everything prejudicial to may be removed, 90.
Moravian Church, 435.
Moreau (N. Y.), Temperance Society at, 31, 82.
Morel, H. (Dr.), on the effects of alcohol, 235–6.
Morgan, Tallie, Article by, 119–24.

Morgan, Thomas J., Article by, 245-6.
Morocco, 12.
Morrill, Lot M. (Senator), on Prohibition in Maine, 503.
Morse, S. A. (Rev.), vi.
Mortality from drink, 435-7.
Morton, Levi P. (Vice-President), 644.
Moselle wines, 19, 647, 649.
Moshesh (Chief), Prohibitory decree of, 14.
Mott, Lucretia, Biographical sketch of, 437-8.
Mugler case, 91 (note), 92-4.
Mulhall, Statistics from, 12, 19, 39, 42, 134, 184.
Murray, William, on pauperism and drink, 466-7.
Muscatel wines, 647, 649.
Must of grapes, 646.

Narcomania, 438-9.
Narcotics, 438-9.
Natal, 14.
National Conventions:
— Democratic, 149, 585.
— Prohibition party, 561-2, 563-4, 565-6, 567-8, 569, 570-2, 575-6.
— Republican, 586, 590, 594.
— Temperance, 631.
National Government, 635-46.
National Prohibition, 439-42.
National Prohibition Bureau, 574.
National Protective Association, 103, 114, 116, 119, 121, 381-2, 387-8, 446.
National Reformer, The, 573.
National Temperance Advocate, The, 442.
National Temperance League (England), 197, 442.
National Temperance Society, 442-3.
Native races, The liquor traffic with, 13-17, 38, 497, 498 (note), 643.
Natural liberty, 471-2.
Navy, Regulations for the, 642-3.
Nazarites, 443.
Nebraska:
— Constitutional Prohibition movement in, 89, 443-50.
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— High License, Results of in, 212, 219, 518-21, 548-50.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 322-3.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 564, 566, 573, 577.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
Negroes, 450-1.
— Legislation concerning sales of liquor to (before emancipation), 275, 276, 278, 287, 289, 290, 302, 304, 318, 320, 326, 331, 345, 346, 347, 354.
— Prohibition, Happy results of among, 557-8.
Neison, Francis G. P., Statistical tables prepared by, 404-5.
Netherlands (see "Holland").
Neutral spirits, 615, 616.
Nevada:
— Brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 323-4.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 577.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
New Bedford (Mass.), Prohibition and High License in, 532.
New Brunswick, 64, 66.
Newburyport (Mass.), High License in, 531.
New England rum, 617.
— for the heathen, 16, 17, 240-1.
New Era, The, 573.
New Hampshire:
— Constitutional Prohibition movement in, 102, 103, 117.
— "Federal permits" in, 383, 384, 524.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 324-6.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 562, 563, 564, 566, 568, 573, 577.
— Prohibition, Results of in, 524.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
New Jersey:
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 326-7.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 566, 568, 573, 577.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
New Mexico:
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 327-8.
New South Wales, 38.
New York:
— Constitutional Prohibition idea originated in, 99.
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Hop-yield of, 234.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 328-31.
— Local Option votes in, 399.
— Opium prohibition in, 460.
— Prohibition in, 530, 562-3 (note).
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 562, 563, 564, 566, 568, 573, 577.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
New York City:
— Arrests in, 211.
— Pauperism in, due to drink, 468.
— Rum power, The, in, 488-9.
— Saloons of, owned by the brewers, 379.
— Sunday law, Enforcement of the, in, 537.
New Zealand, 38.
News, The Chicago, 216.
Nicholas, Emperor (Russia), 40, 603.
Noble, William, 57.
Nolan, Philip A., Article by, 68.
No-License (see "Local Option").
Non-Partisan campaigns, 104-28, 443-50.
Non-Partisan Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 652.
Non-Partisanship, 451-4.
Northampton (Mass.), High License in, 531.
North Carolina:
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 331-2.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 573, 577.
North Dakota:
— Constitutional Prohibition movement in, 102, 126-7.
— Prohibition in, 332-3, 523.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
North Sea, Prohibition of spirits in, 497.
Norway, 454-6.
— International regulations, Action of regarding, 498 (note).
Norwegians (in America), 181.
Nott, Eliphalet (Rev. Dr.), 456-8.
Nova Scotia, 64, 66.
Noyau, a liqueur, 618.
Nuisance acts, 248-51; Iowa, 298; Kansas, 300, 301; New Hampshire, 325-6; North Dakota, 333; South Dakota, 613; Vermont, 353.
Numerical strength of the rum power, 382-5.
Nutrition:
— Alcohol possesses no elements of, 25, 179-80.
— Effects of alcohol on, 22.

Oats, Quantity of used in the manufacture of spirituous liquors, 172.
Octroi duties (France), 185.
O'Donnell, John, Article by, 467-9; see also vi.
Oglethorpe, Prohibitory law of, against spirits, 247, 288-9.
Ohio:
— Anti-License article of the Constitution, 98-9.
— Constitutional Prohibition movement in, 100-1, 102, 106-8.

— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Farmers of, Resolutions by, 171.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 333–7.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 562, 563, 564, 566, 568, 573, 577.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
— Woman's Crusade in, 143–5.
Oklahoma :
— Attempted suspension of Prohibition in, 641 (note).
— Prohibition, Results of in, 524–5.
Olin, John M., Suffrage plank offered by, 576 (note).
Omaha (Neb.), High License in, 210, 212, 217.
O'Malley case, 92.
Ontario, 65, 66.
Opium, 458-61 ; in China, 75–9 ; India, 244–5 ; Persia, 471.
— Recommended by Dr. Rush, 602–3.
Oregon :
— Constitutional Prohibition movement in, 101–2, 103, 115–16.
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Hop culture in, 234.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 337–8.
— Opium prohibition in, 460.
"Original Package" decision, 647.
— Effects of, 512, 517–18.
Oswald, Felix L. (Dr.), Articles by, 38, 68–70, 82–3, 141–3, 147–8, 183–4, 235–6, 420–1, 485–7, 490–3, 580–1, 583–4, 613–14, 620–1.
Out-Still system (India), 242.
Owen, Isambard (Dr.), on the comparative longevity of abstainers and drinkers, 407.
Owen Sunday law (Ohio), 268–9.

Pacific Islands, The liquor traffic with the, 643.
Packard, Samuel W., Article by, 85–6.
Palestine, 461-2.
Palmer, Henry W., on the defeat of Prohibition in Pennsylvania, 122-3.
Paraguay, 613.
Paralyzing effects of alcohol, 23, 24, 25.
Paresis, caused by alcohol, 21.
Parker, B. F., Article by, 241-2.
Parkes, E. A. (Dr.) :
— Medical declaration drawn up by, 423-4.
— on the chemical constituents of beer, 414.
——— the effects of alcohol, 482, 486.
Parties :
— Democratic, 148–53.
— Prohibition, 559–80.
— Republican, 585-95.
Passover wine, 462-5.
Pauperism and drink, 465–7 ; see also 139, 153, 189-90, 259.
-- Physicians, English, on, 423.
— Prohibitory laws, Effects of, 504, 508-9, 514-15, 531, 535.
— Supreme Court of the United States on, 93, 473.
Paxton, Andrew, 267.
Pearson, John (Rev.), on law defiance in Cincinnati, 268-9.
Penalties, 467-9.
Peninsular Herald, The, 573.
Penitentiary statistics, 505, 509, 516, 520-1, 528.
Penn, William, 246.
Pennsylvania :
— Constitutional Prohibition movement in, 89, 102, 103, 119-24.
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 334.
— High License, Results of in, 213-14, 269.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 338-41.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 563, 564, 566, 568, 573, 577.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
Pepper, George W. (Rev.), Father Mathew's letter to, 420.
Peppermint liqueur, 618.
Per capita consumption (see "Consumption of Liquors").
Percentages of alcohol in liquors, 19, 616, 647.
Perham (Governor), on Prohibition in Maine, 504, 538.
Perry, 19, 649.
Persia, 469-71.
— International regulations, Action of regarding, 498 (note).
— (See also "Historical and Philosophical.")
Personal Liberty, 471-4.
Peru, 613.
Peters, John A. (Congressman), on Prohibition in Maine, 503.
Petitions, 474-7.
Pharmacopœia, The United States, on the dangers of wines, 648.
Philadelphia (Pa.), High License in, 211, 213-14, 218.
Phillips, Wendell :
— Biographical sketch of, 477-8.
——— on the political power of the liquor traffic, 488-9.
Phtisis from alcohol, 25.
Phylloxera, 478-82, 493 (note).
Physical training, 482-3.
Physicians (see "Medical Testimony").
— Atlanta, Testimony concerning Prohibition and license in, 556.
— Prescriptions of alcohol by, 159, 420-5. (See also the digests of State laws, 275 360.)
Physiological effects of drink, 20-6. (See also "Medical Testimony.")
Pickler, J. A. (Congressman), on Prohibition in Oklahoma, 525.
Pierce, Edwin C., 469.
Pierce, Franklin (President), 147.
Pierpont, John (Rev. Dr.), Biographical sketch of, 483–4.
Pioneer, The, 573.
Pioneer Press, The St. Paul, 594.
Pike, Frederic A., vi.
Piper Heidsick, how imitated, 8.
Pitman, Robert C. (Judge), iv, v.
— Candidacy of, 563, 566.
— on idiocy, 235.
——— pauperism, 465-6.
——— the results of Prohibition in Massachusetts, 528-9.
Pittsburgh (Pa.), High License in, 217–18, 270.
Plain spirit, 616.
Plastering of wines, 133, 647.
Platforms :
— Democratic, 149, 152, 585-6.
— Prohibition party, 562, 563-4, 565-6, 567-8, 569, 570-2, 575-6.
— Republican, 586, 590, 594.
Plato, 220–1, 229-30.
Plebiscites in Scotland, 608.
Pledge, 484-5.
— of the Bands of Hope, 40 ; R. Bolton, 484-5 ; Cadets of Temperance, 60 ; Catholic Total Abstinence Union, 68 ; Commercial Temperance League, 85 ; Good Templars, 241 ; Greenock Society, 607 ; Knights of Temperance, 264 ; Joseph Livesey, 389 ; Father Mathew, 417 ; Moreau Society, 82 ; Washingtonians, 649 ; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 651.
Plenary Council decrees, 597-8.
Pliny, 49, 54, 413.
Plumb, P. B. (Senator), on Prohibition in Kansas, 510
Plumley, Frank, on Prohibition in Vermont, 523.
"Poisoners-general," 650.
Poisons, 485-7.
— Used in adulterating (see "Adulteration").

Poles (in America), 181.
Police, Cost of supporting the, 546-7.
Police Power of the States, 93-4.
Police returns (see "Arrests and Commitments").
Policy of the liquor traffic, 387–9. (See also "Methods of the anti-Prohibitionists.")
Political corruption, 487-90. See also 107-8, 110, 111-12, 115, 116, 120-3, 126, 217, 381-2, 445-7, 448-9, 501, 572.
Polk, James K. (President), 147.
Pond law (Ohio), 107, 335.
Pope, The, 46, 68, 598-9.
Popoff, Peter, 603 (note).
Popular fallacies, 490-3.
Population, Increase of, how affected by Prohibition, 551-4.
Port, 19, 494, 647, 649.
— How imitated, 8.
Porter, 19, 414.
Portland (Me.), Prohibition in, 505-6.
Portugal, 493-4.
— Consumption of liquors in, 134.
— International regulations, Action of regarding, 498 (note).
— Phylloxera, ravages of the in, 481.
Potato spirits, 20, 614.
Potheen, 618.
Pottinger, Sir Henry, 76.
Poverty, Relations of drink to (see "Pauperism").
Powderly, Terence V., on the relations of labor and drink, 265–6 (note).
Powell, A. M., 634 (note).
Prentice, G. H. (Rev.), 214.
Presbyterian Church, 61, 494-5.
— Deliverance in Nebraska on High License, 215.
Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates of the Prohibition party, Biographical sketches of, 56–7, 58–9, 146, 158–9, 176–7, 603, 605, 610, 620, 626.
Presidential declaration, 147.
Press, The hostility of the, 28, 104, 111, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118–19, 121-3, 128, 446-7.
Preston, The seven men of, 389.
Price, J. C. (Rev. Dr.), Article by, 450-1.
Prince Edward Island, 64, 66.
Prison officials, Testimonies from, 142, 632 (note).
Probate Judges of Kansas, Testimony from, 507-9.
Production of liquors, 128-35.
Profits of the brewers, 374.
Prohibition, International aspects of, 496-9.
Prohibition, National, 439–42.
Prohibition party, 559–80.
— and the Anti-Saloon Republicans, 29.
——— the Abolition party, compared, 30–3.
——— Woman Suffrage, 163-4, 166, 167, 564, 565, 568, 569, 571, 576.
——— Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 652.
— Constitutional Prohibition contests, Influence of in, 115, 116, 118, 120, 127, 441, 445.
— Phillips, Wendell, on the necessity of, 477.
— Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates of, Biographical sketches of, 56–7, 58-9, 146, 158-9, 176-7, 603, 605, 610, 620, 626.
— Ross, William, Resolution of, 600-1.
Prohibition party (Australia), 37.
Prohibition party (Canada), 66.
Prohibition party (England), 196.
Prohibition, Principle of, 495-9, 618-20.
— Advocacy of, by Gen. James Appleton, 34; Dr. Albert Barnes, 43; Lyman Beecher, 44-5; business men, 447; W. E. Channing, D.D., 72; Lord Chesterfield, 617 (note); J. W. Chickering, D.D., 72; W. E. Dodge, 157; educators, 104, 448; farmers, 104, 170–1, 448; John B. Gough, 193–4; Horace Greeley, 198–200; Thomas Guthrie, D.D., 201; Heman Humphrey, D.D., 234; Labor leaders, 123, 265–6, 447–8; Abraham Lincoln, 368, 369; Horace Mann, 415–16; Father Mathew, 420; Dr. Eliphalet Nott, 458; Senator Reagan, 112-13; Dr. Francis Wayland, 650.
— Democratic party, The, and, 148-53.
— Republican party, The, and, 587-95.
— Upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States, 90–4, 473.
— Votes on, 99, 100–28, 396-400.
— (See also the various religious denominations.)
Prohibition, Reasons against, 26–7
Prohibition, Results of, 499 559.
— Opium consumption not increased under Prohibitory laws, 461.
Prohibitory laws, general (including measures against spirits only, and other rude acts, but not Local Option statutes):
— United States:
——— Federal: Alaska, 277; Indians, 295, 641-2; Oklahoma, 337; Army and Navy, 642–3.
——— State and Territorial: Connecticut, 282; Delaware, 286; Georgia (Oglethorpe's), 288–9; Illinois, 292; Indiana, 294; Iowa, 296-9; Kansas, 299-302; Maine, 306-9; Massachusetts, 311, 312; Michigan, 315; Mississippi (sales in quantities less than a gallon, 1839), 318; Nebraska, 322; New Hampshire, 324-6; New York, 329; North Dakota, 332-3; Ohio (against consumption on the premises), 334-5; Oregon, 337; Rhode Island, 341-2; Sioux Lands (Minnesota), 316; South Dakota, 613; Tennessee (persons whose principal object was the selling of liquor were not to be licensed, 1823), 347; Vermont, 351–3.
——— Against distillation only, 276, 288, 290, 318, 329, 331, 338, 345. 348, 354.
——— Constitutional, 100–2.
——— Federal regulations, Interference of with the success of, 257.
——— Soundness of, upheld by the higest Courts, 90-4.
— Other countries: Ancient, 73-4 (see also "Historical and Philosophical"); Africa, 13-15, 16, 498 (note); Mohammedan countries (see "Mohammedans"); North Sea, 497; Norway, 454; Samoan Islands, 497; Sandwich Islands, 606–7; Sweden, 623.
Proof spirit, 616.
Property rights, The claim of, 89–96.
Propylic alcohol, 18, 155.
Prostitution, naturally allied to liquor-selling, 361, 372.
— Practically licensed in Omaha, 362.
Protestant Episcopal Church, 81, 580.
ovidence (R. I.), Prohibition and license in, 525, 543-4.
Public sentiment, 580-1.
Pugh, Esther, vi.
Pullman (Ill.), Prohibition in, 536.
Pulque, a Mexican intoxicant, 428-9.
"Pulverize the rum power!" 401.
Pure spirits, 616.

Quakers, 30, 186, 246.
Quay, Matthew S., 29, 121, 122.
Quebec, 64, 66.
Queen's Bench, Decisions by the, 94.
Queensland, 38.
Quincy (Mass.), Prohibition in, 531.

Race troubles, 557–8.
Railroad companies, Regulations of concerning the use of liquor by employes, 632 (note).
Raleigh (N. C.), Prohibition and High License in, 535.
Ramabai, Pundita, 244.
Ranavalona (Queen), 13.
Raster Resolution, The, 590–1, 594.

Ratafia, a liqueur, 618.
Raum, Green B. (Commissioner), and the brewers, 639.
Reagan, John H. (Senator), 112–13.
Real estate agents, Testimony from, 555–6.
Rechabites, 581.
Rechabites, Independent Order of, 582.
— in foreign countries: Australasia, 37; England, 197; Ireland, 259.
— Longevity statistics of, 404–6.
Rectification, 582–3.
Red Ribbon, 57, 175.
Red wines, 648.
Reformed drinkers, 583–4.
Reformed Episcopal Church, 584.
Reformed Presbyterian Church, 584–5.
Reid, William (Rev.), vi.
Reimestad, T. S. (Prof.), Article by, 454–6.
Religious denominations, 11, 17, 41–2, 61, 81–2, 96, 145, 154, 160, 169–70, 186, 187, 263, 410–11, 425–8, 494–5, 580, 584–5, 597–600, 608, 634, 646, 650.
Rents paid by saloon-keepers, 606.
Repeals (notable instances), 63, 124–6, 588, 589–90, 591.
Republican party, 585–95.
— Anti-Saloon movement in, 27–30.
— Constitutional Prohibition contests, Behavior of in, 104–28, 444–5, 449–50.
— Declaration of concerning the Internal Revenue, 256.
— Foreign-born voters, Influence of upon, 182.
— Intolerance of, 574.
Resources of the rum power, 381–2.
Restriction, 595–7.
— Anti-Prohibition view of, 27.
— Distinction between restriction and license or tax, 207–8.
Retailers, 371–2, 378–9, 383–4.
— Legislation relating to (see "Legislation").
Revenue (Liquor):
— Federal, 251–4, 638.
——— Frauds of the liquor-makers, 375 (note).
— Great Britain, 195; France, 181; Germany, 191; India, 242–3; Ireland, 258–9; Jamaica, 260; Japan, 261; Norway, 456; Persia, 470–1; Russia, 604; Sweden, 624.
Revenue (Tobacco), 629.
Revenue argument, The, 121, 122, 215–16, 492–3.
— Emperor of China, The, Noble words of, 76.
— Grier (Justice) on, 90.
— Loss of revenue is more than made good by the advantages of Prohibition, 545–51.
— Madagascar, The Queen of, Example of, 13.
Rhine wines, 19, 647, 649.
Rhode Island:
— Constitutional Prohibition in, 101, 102, 103, 109–11.
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— High License and Prohibition, Results of in, 124–6, 269, 525–6, 543–4.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 341–4.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 566, 568, 573, 577.
Ribbon movements, 57.
Rice, Helen G., Article by, 409–10.
Richardson, A. M. (Rev.), 104 (note).
Richardson, B. W. (Dr.), iv.
— Article by, 20–6.
— on alcoholic epilepsy, 161.
——— the maximum strength of fermented liquors, 614.
——— the valuelessness of alcohol as a food, 179.
Richmond, T. C., Article by, 476–7; see also vi.
Riley, Ashbel Wells, Biographical sketch of, 597.
Ritter, Eli F., 634 (note).
Robbins, Alonzo, Table prepared by, 615.
Robie (Governor), on Prohibition in Maine, 504.
Rockford (Ill.), High License and Prohibition in, 210, 212, 535.
Roman Catholic Church, 597–600.
Romans, The (see "Historical and Philosophical").
Roosevelt, George W., Report of on the phylloxera, 479.
Root, H. G., on Prohibition in Vermont, 523.
Rosewater, Edward, 445.
Ross, William, Biographical sketch of, 600–1.
Rough wines, 648.
Roumelia, 633.
Roussillon wines, 649.
Rowan County (Ky.), Murders in, 558.
Royal Templars of Temperance, 61, 601.
"Rub-a-dub agitation," 33.
Rum, 19, 619.
— Exports of from the United States to Africa, 240–1.
— on the Congo, 15–16, 498 (note).
Rum Power, The, 384–5, 601.
Rush, Benjamin, Biographical sketch of, 601–3.
— Inebriate asylums advocated by, 247.
Russell, Frank D., Article by, 582.
Russell, John (Rev.), Biographical sketch of, 603; see also vi.
Russia, 603–5.
— Consumption of liquors in, 134.
— International regulations, Action of regarding, 498 (note).
— Phylloxera, Ravages of the in, 482.
Ryder, Emma Brainerd, 242 (note), 244.

Sabine, Henry, on Prohibition in Iowa, 542.
Sack, 649.
St. Croix, 154.
St. John, John P., Biographical sketch of, 605; see also vi.
St. John campaign, 570–4.
St. Louis (Mo.), High License in, 210, 212, 217.
St. Paul (Minn.), High License in, 521.
Saké, a Japanese distilled drink, 260–2.
Salem (Mass.), Results of High License in, 210, 531.
Salisbury, Lord, 94–5.
Saloon, 605–6.
"Saloon, Never try to defend the," 122.
Saltaire (Eng.), Prohibition in, 536.
Samlag system, 455.
Samoa, Prohibition in, 497.
Samshu, a Chinese distilled drink, 74–5.
Samson, G. W., Articles by, 50–7, 86–8, 220–32, 462–5.
Sanborn, B. T., on Prohibition in Maine, 503.
Sandwich Islands, 606–7.
Satterlee, W. W. (Rev.), vi.
Saumur wines, 649.
Sauterne wines, 649.
"Save the Boys," 267.
Scandinavians (in America), 127, 181.
Scheltema, Adema von (Rev. Dr.), 232.
Schmidt Bros., Case of, 92.
Schnapps, 618.
Schweigaard (Prof.), 454.
Sciences, manufactures, arts, etc., Spirits used in the, 18, 19, 130–1, 615.
Scientific Temperance Educational laws, 607.
Scientific testimony (see "Medical Testimony").
Scomp, H. A. (Prof.), Article by, 390–6.
Scotch whiskey, 19, 42.
Scotland, 607–8.
Scott, George R., 573.
Scott act (Canada), 62.
Scott Tax law (Ohio), 107, 335.
Scottish Temperance League, 608.
Screen laws:
— Connecticut, 285; Delaware, 287; Massachusetts, 313; Michigan, 316; Nebraska, 323; Rhode Island, 344; South Carolina (1839), 345.

Sedwards, Jeffery, 257.
Sentiment, Strength of, 102.
Seven men of Preston, 389.
Seventh-Day Adventists, 608.
Sewall, Thomas (Dr.), 608-9.
Seymour, Horatio, 149.
Shaftesbury Park (Eng.), Prohibition in, 536.
Sherbet, 51.
Sherlin, Charles A., vi.
Sherman, John (Senator), 168, 593.
Sherry, 19, 614, 647, 649.
— How imitated, 8.
Shu-King, Book of, 73.
Sibley, Frank J., vi, 264 (note).
Sickness, Abstainers less liable to than drinkers, 26. (See also "Longevity.")
Signal, The Delaware, 573.
Sikes, J. R. (Rev.), 122.
Sims, William, on Prohibition in Kansas, 540.
"Sin, It can never be legalized without," 426.
Sin *per se*, 609.
Singleton, W. F., vi.
Sioux City (Ia.), Prohibition in, 517.
"Six Sermons on Intemperance," 44.
Slavery Issue, Aspects of the, 30-3, 585-7.
Sloan, William H. (Rev.), Article by, 428-30.
Slocumb law (Nebraska), 209, 322-3.
Smith, Gerrit, Biographical sketch of, 610.
Smith, Green Clay, Biographical sketch of, 610. (See also vi, and "Prohibition Party.")
Smith, James (Rev.), Discourse by, 369.
Smith, James H. (Consul), Report of on the phylloxera, 481-2.
Smith, Sidney, on the results of legislative discriminations in favor of beer, 366.
Smith Sunday law (Ohio), 107, 335.
Smollett, Tobias G., on the effects of gin-drinking in England, 273.
Sobieski, John, Article by, 180-2.
Social Purity, 610-11.
Soldiers and Sailors, Regulations concerning the sale of drink to, 642-3.
Solidarity of the rum power, 370-89.
Somali, 13.
Somerville (Mass.), Prohibition in, 531.
Sons of Jonadab, 631.
Sons of Temperance, 611-12.
— Death-rate of, 405.
— Lincoln, Abraham, a member of the Order, 369, 370.
— in Australasia, 37 ; Canada, 61.
South Africa, 14-15.
South America, 612-13.
South Carolina:
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 344-6.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
South Dakota:
— Constitutional Prohibition in, 101,102, 109, 126-7.
— Prohibition in, 523.
— Prohibitory law of, 613.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
Southern problem, How affected by the drink system, 236-7, 557-8.
Southwick, Thomas S., Article by, 606-7.
Spain, 613-14.
— Consumption of liquors in, 134.
— International regulations, Action of regarding, 498 (note).
— Phylloxera, ravages of the in, 481.
Sparkling wines, 648.
Sparta, 198, 621-2.
Special taxes, 257, 636.
Spence, F. S., Article by, 60-7.
"Spies," The liquor-sellers' denunciations of, 268.
Spirit of wine, 616.
Spirit ration in the army, 642.
Spirits, 614-18.
— Used in fortifying wines, 7-9, 12, 14, 481, 614, 647.
—— in the arts, manufactures, sciences, etc., 18, 19 130-1, 615.
Spirituous liquors, 614, 616-18.
— Adulterations of, 10, 616.
— Alcoholic strength of, 19, 616.
— Consumption of, 128-35.
— Discriminations against (see "Light Liquors;" also the digests of State laws, 275-360).
— Distillation of, Process of, 154-5.
— Expenditure for, 136-7.
— Exports of, 240-1.
— "Fine" whiskey, Comparative insignificance of the production of, 376-7.
— Imports of, 238-7.
— Manufacturing interests, Different branches of the, 376-8.
— Materials used in the production of, 172.
— Presidential declaration against, 147.
— Revenue from (Federal), 254.
— Taxes on (Federal), 636.
Springfield (Mass.), High License and Prohibition in, 210, 532.
Stalker, M., on Prohibition in Iowa, 542.
Stanley, Henry M., on the fatal effects of strong drink, 15.
Starch of grain, converted into sugar by malting, 58.
State, The, and Prohibition, 618-20.
States, Powers of the, 635, 645-6.
Statutory Prohibition as distinguished from Constitutional Prohibition, 97-8.
Stearns, John N., vi, 99 (note).
Stevens, A. A., vi.
Stevens, Thomas, on drink in Russia, 604.
Stewart, E. D. (Mrs.), 143.
Stewart, Gideon T., Biographical sketch of, 620. (See also vi, and "Prohibition party.")
Still wines, 648.
Stimulants, 620-1.
Stone v. Mississippi, Case of, 93, 645.
Stopping suddenly, No danger from, 632 (note).
Stout, 414.
Stratton, Joel, 193.
Strength of alcoholic liquors, 19, 615, 616, 647.
Strength of the body, How affected by alcoholic drink, 22-4, 491.
Strong drink, 621.
Stuart, Moses, Biographical sketch of, 621.
Stubbs, H. S., Statistics prepared by, 505-6.
Sudder still system (India), 242.
Suffrage plank, 564, 565, 568, 569, 571, 576.
Suicide and drink, 45, 365.
Sumner, Charles, 31-2, 33.
Sumptuary laws, 621-2.
— Democratic party, The, and, 149-50.
Sunday-closing, 622-3.
— Beneficial results of, 537.
— Legislation concerning (see digests of State laws, 275-360).
Supreme Court of the United States, 644-6. (See also "Judicial Decisions.")
Swartz, Joel (Rev. Dr.), Article by, 167-9.
Sweden, 623-4.
— Consumption of liquors in, 133-4.
— International regulations, Action of regarding, 498 (note).
Sweet wines, 648.
Switzerland, 624.

Switzler, W. F., Estimates of, 373.
Syndicates, English brewery, 374-5.

Tammany Hall, 152, 489.
Taney (Chief Justice), on Prohibition, 645.
Tao Kwang (Emperor), Noble words of, 76.
"Tapering off" plan, The, 632 (note).
Tariff duties:
— on liquors, 238-9, 637-8.
——— tobacco, 629-30.
Tariff issue, Effects of upon the Prohibition movement, 575.
Tasmania, 38.
Tattler, The, on wine adulterations, 7.
Tax, as distinguished from license, 168, 624-5.
Taxes (General), How affected by Prohibition, 545-51.
Taxes (Liquor), levied by the Federal Government, 254, 636-8.
Tax-rates under Prohibition and High License compared, 548-50.
Taylor, Zachary (President), 147.
Teachers and Prohibition, 448.
Temperance, Definitions of, 35, 221, 599, 625.
Temperance Hospital, The London, 424-5.
Temperature:
— of distillation, 18, 20, 155.
——— fermentation, 8, 58.
——— the body, How affected by alcohol, 23-4.
Templars of Honor and Temperance, 625.
Temple, Frederick (Bishop), 442.
Temptation, 625-6.
Teneriffe wines, 649.
Tennessee:
— Constitutional Prohibition movement in, 101, 102, 103, 114-15.
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 346-8.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 573, 577.
Tequila, a Mexican intoxicant, 429.
Territories, The, 634, 641. (See also "Alaska," "Arizona," "New Mexico," "Oklahoma" and "Utah.")
Texas:
— Constitutional Prohibition movement in, 101, 102, 103, 112-13.
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 348-50.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 573, 577.
"Third" parties, Charles Sumner on, 32.
Thomas, John Lloyd, vi, 386 (note).
Thomas, W. H., on the dishonesty of fruit distillers, 375 (note).
Thompson, G. B., vi.
Thompson, H. A. (Rev. Dr.), Biographical sketch of, 623.
Thompson Thomas, R., vi.
Three-Mile law (Arkansas), 278-9.
Thwing, E P. (Dr.), Article by, 626-9.
Tied houses, 379.
Tilden, Samuel J., 149.
Times, The London:
— on the liquor traffic in the Pacific islands, 643 (note).
——— the results of legislative discriminations in favor of beer, 366.
Tinling, J. F. B., 197 (note).
Tisdel, W. P., on the liquor traffic in Africa, 16, 17.
Title-deeds, Prohibition by, 536.
Tobacco, 626-30; see also 254.
Toddy:
— a fermented drink of India, 649.
— a spirituous preparation, 616.
Tokay wines, 19, 647, 649.
Tolstoi, Leo (Count), 605.
Tomlinson, W. P., on Prohibition in Topeka, 511.
Topeka (Kan.), Prohibition in, 511.
Total abstinence, 630-2.
— Bible, The, and (see "Bible and Drink," "Bible Wines," and "Historical and Philosophical").
— Death-rate among abstainers as compared with drinkers, 26, 404-9.
— Enjoined by the great religions of the East, 47. (See also "Historical and Philosophical.")
— Fundamental principles (notable arguments), 71-2, 265-6 (note), 368, 457-8, 598-9, 650.
— Longevity, Comparative, of abstainers and drinkers, 404-9.
— Movement and organizations in the United States, 57, 60, 68, 84, 96, 161, 203, 241-2, 262-3, 264, 265-6, 409-10, 416, 419, 582, 601, 611-12, 625, 630-2, 649, 650-2.
——— in other countries: Australasia, 35, 37; Burmah, 59-60; Canada, 61; Denmark, 153; Germany, 190; Great Britain and Ireland, 57, 58, 83, 84, 161, 197, 257-9, 389-90, 417-20, 607-8; Holland, 232-3; India, 244; Norway, 455-6; Persia, 470-1; Sandwich Islands, 607-8; Sweden, 624; Switzerland, 624.
— Pope Leo XIII. on, 598-9.
— Protestant Episcopal Church, Exceptional attitude of, 81.
— (See also "Medical Testimony" and "Religious Denominations.")
Tovey, A. E. J., 374 (notes).
Trade, Effects of Prohibition upon, 537-45.
Trappistine, a liqueur, 618.
Treating, 632-3.
Treaty with China, respecting opium and liquors, 79.
Tribune, The Chicago, 362, 593.
Tribune, The New York, 198-200, 218, 256, 487, 577, 593.
Tripoli, 12.
Tuck, Henry (Dr.), on the comparative longevity of abstainers and drinkers, 409.
Tunis, 12.
Turkey, 633.
— International regulations, Action of regarding, 498 (note).
Turner, C. C., 122.
Tyler, John (President), 147.

Ulung, a Mexican intoxicant, 430.
Unfermented Wines (see "Bible and Drink," "Bible Wines," "Communion Wines" and "Passover Wines").
Union Prohibitory League, The, 453.
Union Signal, The, 651.
Unitarians, 634.
United Brethren Church, 634.
United Kingdom, Consumption of liquors in, 131-2.
United Kingdom Alliance, 196, 197.
— Father Mathew's approval of the, 420.
United Presbyterian Church, 634.
United States Brewers' Association, 10, 92, 111, 113, 114, 163, 202, 256-7, 372-3, 381, 388, 560, 591, 638-9.
United States Dispensatory, 615 (note).
United States Government and the liquor traffic, 634-46; see also 16, 90, 91-4, 245-6, 251-7, 372-3, 439-42, 475-6, 497, 498 (note).
Universalists, 646.
Uraguay, 613.
Usquebaugh, 616.
Utah:
— Brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 350.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.

Vail, Lewis, D., 214 (note), 267.
Valentine, D. M. (Justice), on Prohibition in Kansas, 539, 551.

Van Buren, Martin (President), 147.
Venezuela, 613.
Vermont:
— "Federal permits" in, 383, 384, 522.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 350-3.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 573, 577.
— Prohibition, Results of in, 522-3.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
Vermouth, a liqueur, 19, 618.
Vernon, Leroy, M. (Rev. Dr.), 259.
Vest, George G. (Senator), 91 (note), 92.
"Vested Rights," 90, 91-2, 93, 94, 473.
"Vicious in principle and powerless as a remedy," 426.
Victoria, 38.
Vidal, A., 62.
Villars, I. (Rev. Dr.), 585 (note).
Vinegar, 18, 174, 175.
Vinous fermentation, 174-5.
Vinous Liquors, 646-9.
— Adulterations of, 7-9, 132-3, 647, 648.
— Alcoholic strength of, 19, 647.
— Consumption of, 128-35. (See also the various countries.)
— Expenditure for, 137.
— Exports of, 240.
— Imports of, 238-9.
— Materials used in the manufacture of, 173.
— Not taxed by the Federal Government, 636.
— Pharmacopœia, The United States, on the dangers of, 648.
— Phylloxera, Ravages of the, Effects of, 478-82.
Virginia:
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 353-5.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 573, 577.
Viticultural Commission (California), 374.
Vizetelly, M., 9 (note).
Vodka, a Russian intoxicant, 604.
Voice, The, v, 573.
Vote:
— Constitutional Prohibition, 100-28, 450.
— Local Option, 396-400.
— Prohibition party, 33, 562, 563, 564, 566, 568, 573, 577.
Voters' Union, The, 453.

Wade, Thomas (Sir), on opium in China, 79.
Wage-workers, The drink traffic and, 264-6, 386, 447-8, 536, 544, 554-7.
Walker, Francis A., on the unreliability of statistics of capital invested in manufacturing industries, 380 (note).
Walker, George (Consul), on the adulteration of wines, 9, 647.
Walruff case, 91.
Walsh (Archbishop), 259.
Walworth (Chancellor), 33.
Ward, Henry, D.D., Article by, 96-7; see also vi, 634 (note).
Warmth, Deceptiveness of the increase in, caused by alcohol, 22-3, 83.
Washington (D. C.), The liquor traffic in, 641.
Washington (State of):
— Brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Constitutional Prohibition movement in, 102, 103, 127.
— Hop culture in, 234.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 355-6.
— Tobacco to minors, Legislation against, 630.
Washingtonians, The, 203, 649.
— Lincoln, Abraham, as a promoter of their agitation, 368-9.
Water, Strong affinity of alcohol for, 20, 154.
Watterson, Henry, 149.
Wayland, Francis. Biographical sketch of, 649-50.
Webb, James A. & Son, Estimate by of the quantity of spirits used in the arts, etc., 19.
Webb, R. C., on Prohibition in Iowa, 542.
Webb, W. C. (Judge), on Prohibition in Kansas, 510.
Webster, Daniel, on the Anti-Slavery agitation, 33.
Welch, M. M., on Prohibition in Atlanta, 544-5.
Wells, David A., Report by on the use of spirits in the arts, etc., 130-1.
Wenngren, C. A., Article by, 623-4.
Wescott, W. Wynne (Dr.), on mortality from drink, 436.
Wesley, John, 88, 650.
Wesleyan Methodist Church, 650.
West, Mary Allen, vi.
West Virginia:
— Constitutional Prohibition movement in, 102, 103, 116-17.
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 356-8.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 573, 577.
Wheat, Quantity of used in the manufacture of spirituous liquors, 172.
Wheeler, E. J., Articles by, 609, 618-20; see also iv, 138, 437, 503-4, 505 (note), 527 (note).
Whig party, 30, 32, 33, 585-6.
Whiskey, 19, 616.
— Adulterations of, 10, 616.
— "Fine," Comparative insignificance of the production of, 376-7.
Whiskey frauds, 639.
Whiskey Power (see "Liquor Traffic").
Whiskey Rebellion, 252, 268.
Whiskey Trust, 377-8, 449 (note).
White, John F. (Judge), 123.
White Cross, The, 611.
White House, Wine in the, 203-4, 644.
White Ribbon, 57, 651.
White wines, 8, 12, 648.
Wholesalers, 383-4, 636. (See also the digests of State laws, 275-360.)
Whyte, James, Article by, 404-6.
Wieselgren (Archdeacon), 623.
Wilberforce (Canon), 198.
Wilder, D. W., on Prohibition in Kansas, 540.
Wilkinson, W. C. (Prof.), vi.
Willard, Frances E.:
— Article by, 610-11; see also vi, 650 (note).
— Plea of before the Republican Convention, 594.
— Suffrage plank, Championship of by, 576 (note).
Willey, Austin, 31.
Williams, C. F. (Rev.), on Prohibition in Iowa, 516.
Williams, E. T. (Rev.), 72 (note).
Williams, James W., Article by, 109-11.
Williams, S. Wells (Dr.), 72, 77.
Wilson, Henry (Vice-President), Biographical sketch of, 650.
Wilson, James F. (Senator), on Prohibition in Iowa, 516.
Wilson, Samuel G. (Rev.), Article by, 469-71.
Wilson bill, The, 646.
Windom, William (Secretary), 28, 644.
Wine and Spirit Traders' Society, 640.
Wine-manufacturers, Strength, capital invested, etc. (see "Liquor Traffic").
Wines, 19, 646-9. (See also "Vinous Liquors.")
Wines, Fred. H., Estimates by, 139.
Wisconsin:
— Distillers, brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 358-60.
— Prohibition party, Vote of in, 564, 566, 568, 573, 577.
Witness, The, 573.
Woburn (Mass.), Prohibition and High License in, 533.
"Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink," 225.

Wolfe campaign, 120, 575.
Woman Suffrage:
— General principles, 162-7.
— Prohibition party, The, and, 564, 565, 568, 569, 571, 576.
Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 650-2.
— and the Internal Revenue, 257.
——— the Prohibition party, 569, 572, 576 (note), 652.
— Juvenile department of, 409-10.
— Work of in Constitutional Amendment campaigns, 99, 128, 445; among foreigners, 182; for social purity, 610-11; for scientific temperance education, 607.
— Foreign countries: Australasia, 37; Burmah, 59; Canada, 61; China, 75; Holland, 232-3; India, 244; Sandwich Islands, 607.
Women's Temperance Association, British, 58.
Wood, D. W., 202.
Wood spirit, 18, 20, 616.
Woodbridge, Mrs. Mary A., 106 (note), 107 (note).
Woodbury, Charlotte, F., vi, 632 (note).
Woodruff, C. S. (Rev.), vi.
Woods, Leonard (Rev. Dr.), 630.
Worcester (Mass.), Prohibition and High License in, 532.

Wort, 58.
Wright, B. F., 99, 100, 105 (note).
Wright, Carroll D., Statistical reports of,
— on divorce, 155-6.
——— the percentage of crime due to drink, 529 (note).
Wright, Edwin V. (Prof.), vi.
Wu Wang, 73.
Wyatt, Francis, 10, 172.
Wynehamer case, 90.
Wyoming:
— Brewers and liquor-dealers in, 383, 384.
— Legislation (Liquor) in, 360.

Xenophon, 220-1, 228.

Yeast, a product of fermentation, 10, 58, 174-5.
Young Crusaders, 81.
Young Men's Prohibition Association, 574.
Yucatan, 430.

Zanzibar, 14.

2531

WITHDRAWN FROM
JUNIATA COLLEGE LIBRARY

JUNIATA COLLEGE
2820 9100 076 839 5